

Ramstad	Shays	Thornberry
Regula	Sherwood	Thune
Reynolds	Shinkus	Tiahrt
Riley	Shuster	Toomey
Rogan	Simpson	Trafficant
Rogers	Skeen	Upton
Rohrabacher	Smith (MI)	Vitter
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Roukema	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Royce	Souder	Wamp
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Watkins
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Watts (OK)
Salmon	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Sanford	Sununu	Weldon (PA)
Saxton	Sweeney	Weller
Scarborough	Talent	Whitfield
Schaffer	Tancredo	Wicker
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wilson
Sessions	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Shadegg	Terry	Young (AK)
Shaw	Thomas	Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie	Gordon	Neal
Ackerman	Green (TX)	Oberstar
Allen	Gutierrez	Obey
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Oliver
Baca	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Baldacci	Hill (IN)	Pallone
Baldwin	Hilliard	Pascarell
Barcia	Hinchey	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hinojosa	Payne
Becerra	Holden	Pelosi
Bentsen	Holt	Phelps
Berkley	Hooley	Pickett
Berman	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Berry	Inslee	Price (NC)
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Blumenauer	(TX)	Reyes
Bonior	Jefferson	Rivers
Borski	John	Rodriguez
Boswell	Johnson, E.B.	Roemer
Boucher	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Boyd	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kennedy	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Sanchez
Capps	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Capuano	Kind (WI)	Sandlin
Cardin	Kleczka	Sawyer
Clayton	Klink	Schakowsky
Clement	Kucinich	Scott
Clyburn	LaFalce	Serrano
Condit	Lampson	Sherman
Conyers	Lantos	Shows
Costello	Larson	Siskisky
Coyne	Lee	Skelton
Cramer	Levin	Slaughter
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Cummings	Lipinski	Spratt
Danner	Lofgren	Stabenow
Davis (FL)	Lowey	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
DeFazio	Luther	Strickland
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
DeLauro	Markey	Tauscher
Deutsch	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dixon	McDermott	Thurman
Doggett	McGovern	Tierney
Dooley	McKinney	Towns
Doyle	Meehan	Turner
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Menendez	Velázquez
Etheridge	Millender	Visclosky
Evans	McDonald	Waters
Farr	Miller, George	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Minge	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Weiner
Ford	Moakley	Wexler
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Weygand
Frost	Moran (VA)	Wise
Gejdenson	Murtha	Woolsey
Gephardt	Nadler	Wu
Gonzalez	Napolitano	Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Cooksey	Smith (WA)
Carson	Forbes	Vento
Chenoweth-Hage	Matsui	
Clay	McNulty	

□ 1652

Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EHLERS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4811, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 1655

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor today H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 Appropriations Act for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. I urge all Members to support this bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a bill with total discretionary spending of \$13.281 billion. This compares to an enacted level, excluding emergency spending and including scoring adjustments, of \$13.432 billion. The President requested \$15.132 billion for the programs funded through this bill. In short, the bill responsibly reduces foreign aid spending by \$151 million below fiscal year 2000 and by \$1.8 billion below the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Mr. Chairman, there are those including the ranking member the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who are disappointed in some of the funding levels for specific programs and activities covered by this bill. I sympathize with them, but we have a 302(b) allocation that limits us to the spending in this bill, and I have no choice but to live within that level. While it is true that the pending bill significantly cuts foreign aid spending below what the President has requested, I disagree with the rhetoric that we may hear today about the bad things that this bill does. Let me be clear: this bill preserves U.S. national interests and maintains American commitments abroad.

The bill increases funding above last year's level for a number of critical initiatives which support U.S. national interests and which help to achieve America's humanitarian goals. These include increasing the child survival account by \$119 million to a total of \$834 million. Mr. Chairman, we receive more requests, more letters of support about the child survival than any other single issue in this bill.

I know my colleagues will be pleased to hear that we have made such a significant increase once again in this crucial child survival account.

We are increasing HIV/AIDS funding by \$27 million, up to \$202 million; non-proliferation and antiterrorism programs by \$25 million, up to \$241 million; increasing the fund for Ireland by \$5.4 million, up to \$25 million; increasing the Peace Corps by \$13 million, up to \$258 million; and increasing refugee programs by \$20 million, up to \$657 million.

□ 1700

In addition, the pending bill fully funds the President's request for economic and military assistance for Israel, Egypt and Jordan; and this includes an increase of \$60 million in military assistance for Israel. Indeed, 39 percent of the funds in this bill, or over \$5.2 billion, will be available and be provided to the Middle East.

Let me just comment once again about the controversy that has been discussed in the last several months about the Phalcon sale by Israel to China. As of this morning, as I announced earlier on the floor, the Israeli government contacted me by telephone

and told me Mr. Barak had requested that I be informed and that the Congress be informed that the Phalcon sale to China has been stopped. I think that is a tremendous step in the right direction, and I applaud the decision of the prime minister in making this decision.

I know many Members of the House have expressed to me and shared in my concern and yet were concerned about the possibility of a lengthy debate. So since that has been consummated and our objective has been fulfilled, there will be no need to discuss that reduction in the early disbursement account for Israel.

Further, this bill continues to support American involvement in Africa and Latin America. H.R. 4811 ensures at least \$1.55 billion for sub-Saharan Africa for development of humanitarian programs next year. In addition, thanks to the efforts of the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of our subcommittee, we have included funds urgently needed for Mozambique, Mada-

gascar, and southern Africa; and the committee directs that development funding for Latin America be no less than the fiscal year 2000 amount.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the pending bill benefits American business by increasing funding for the Export-Import Bank and provides central funding for OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for the U.S. Trade and Development Agency. In addition, the bill, thanks to the efforts of one of our colleagues from Ohio, retains longstanding Buy America requirements and protection for American jobs.

I urge Members today to read the editorial in the Washington Post entitled "An Unobserved War." It states that "not much notice is paid in the West these days to the war in Chechnya."

Unfortunately, the Post is largely correct. While we hear many of our colleagues from the other side complain about various aspects of this bill, I doubt that you will hear any of them complain about the Clinton-Gore administration's deafening silence about Chechnya. According to recent press

reports, Russian military actions in that area are even more brutal than what we had previously thought, including the rape, torture and murder of innocent civilians.

The committee is not silent on this issue, however. No funds may be made available to the government of Russia if that government continues to violate the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe due to the deployment of its military forces in Chechnya. This sends two messages: one, that Russia should live up to its treaty commitments with the West; and, two, that it should end its military campaign in Chechnya.

Mr. Chairman, the balance of the bill is good. Without question, there is room for improvement, and I expect some modifications will be made during the process; but I encourage Members to support its passage today.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following chart for the RECORD, which details the funding provided in this bill, as well as a copy of the Washington Post editorial of July 12, 2000.

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001
(H.R. 4811)
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Subsidy appropriation.....	759,000	963,000	825,000	+ 66,000	-138,000
(Direct loan authorization).....	(1,350,000)	(960,000)	(960,000)	(-390,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(10,400,000)	(15,040,000)	(15,040,000)	(+ 4,640,000)
Administrative expenses.....	55,000	63,000	62,000	+ 7,000	-1,000
Negative subsidy.....	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States.....	799,000	1,011,000	872,000	+ 73,000	-139,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Noncredit account:					
Administrative expenses.....	35,000	39,000	37,000	+ 2,000	-2,000
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections.....	-303,000	-283,000	-283,000	+ 20,000
Subsidy appropriation.....	24,000	24,000	24,000
(Direct loan authorization).....	(130,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(-3,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation.....	-244,000	-220,000	-222,000	+ 22,000	-2,000
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY					
Trade and development agency.....	44,000	54,000	46,000	+ 2,000	-8,000
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance.....	599,000	845,000	696,000	+ 97,000	-149,000
(Loan authorizations).....	(12,880,000)	(17,127,000)	(17,127,000)	(+ 4,247,000)
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Child survival and disease programs fund.....	715,000	659,250	834,000	+ 119,000	+ 174,750
UNICEF.....	(110,000)	(110,000)	(+ 110,000)
Development assistance.....	1,228,000	948,822	1,258,000	+ 30,000	+ 309,178
Development Fund for Africa.....	532,928	-532,928
International disaster assistance.....	202,880	220,000	165,000	-37,880	-55,000
Transition Initiatives.....	40,000	+ 40,000	+ 40,000
Micro & Small Enterprise Development program account:					
Subsidy appropriation.....	1,500	1,500	+ 1,500
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(30,000)	(30,000)	(+ 30,000)
Administrative expenses.....	500	500	+ 500
Urban and environmental credit program account:					
Subsidy appropriation.....	1,500	-1,500
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(14,000)	(-14,000)
Administrative expenses.....	5,000	-5,000
Development credit programs account:					
Subsidy appropriation.....	1,500	+ 1,500	+ 1,500
(By transfer).....	(3,000)	(15,000)	(2,000)	(-1,000)	(-13,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization).....	(40,000)	(213,000)	(49,700)	(+ 9,700)	(-163,300)
Administrative expenses.....	8,000	6,495	+ 6,495	-1,505
Subtotal, development assistance.....	2,154,380	2,369,000	2,306,995	+ 152,615	-62,005
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	43,837	44,489	44,489	+ 652
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development.....	520,000	520,000	509,000	-11,000	-11,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General.....	25,000	27,000	27,000	+ 2,000
Total, Agency for International Development.....	2,743,217	2,960,489	2,887,484	+ 144,267	-73,005
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund:					
Camp David countries.....	1,695,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	-160,000
Other.....	650,500	778,000	673,900	+ 23,400	-104,100
Subtotal, Economic support fund.....	2,345,500	2,313,000	2,208,900	-136,600	-104,100
Emergency funding.....	450,000	-450,000
International Fund for Ireland.....	19,600	25,000	+ 5,400	+ 25,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States.....	535,000	610,000	535,000	-75,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union.....	839,000	830,000	740,000	-99,000	-90,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	4,189,100	3,753,000	3,508,900	-680,200	-244,100
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriation.....	20,000	-20,000
(By transfer).....	(5,000)	(10,000)	(+ 5,000)	(+ 10,000)
Total.....	(5,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)	(+ 5,000)	(-10,000)
African Development Foundation					
Appropriation.....	16,000	-16,000
(By transfer).....	(14,400)	(16,000)	(+ 1,600)	(+ 16,000)
Total.....	(14,400)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(+ 1,600)
Peace Corps					
Appropriation.....	245,000	275,000	258,000	+ 13,000	-17,000

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001
(H.R. 4811)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Department of State					
International narcotics control and law enforcement.....	305,000	312,000	305,000		-7,000
Assistance to Plan Colombia		256,000			-256,000
Migration and refugee assistance	625,000	658,212	645,000	+ 20,000	-13,212
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....	12,500	20,000	12,500		-7,500
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs.....	216,600	346,740	241,600	+ 25,000	-105,140
Total, Department of State	1,159,100	1,592,952	1,204,100	+ 45,000	-388,852
Department of the Treasury					
International affairs technical assistance	1,500	7,000	2,000	+ 500	-5,000
Debt restructuring	123,000	262,000	82,400	-40,600	-179,600
United States community adjustment and investment program	10,000	10,000		-10,000	-10,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury	134,500	279,000	84,400	-50,100	-194,600
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	8,470,917	8,896,441	7,942,884	-528,033	-953,557
Appropriations	(8,020,917)	(8,896,441)	(7,942,884)	(-78,033)	(-953,557)
Emergency funding	(450,000)			(-450,000)	
(By transfer)	(22,400)	(15,000)	(28,000)	(+ 5,600)	(+ 13,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(84,000)	(213,000)	(79,700)	(-4,300)	(-133,300)
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training	50,000	55,000	52,500	+ 2,500	-2,500
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants:					
Camp David countries	3,220,000	3,280,000	3,280,000	+ 60,000	
Other	200,000	258,200	230,000	+ 30,000	-28,200
Subtotal, grants	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,510,000	+ 90,000	-28,200
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)		(-2,505)
Total, Foreign Military Financing	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,510,000	+ 90,000	-28,200
Emergency Funding	1,375,000			-1,375,000	
Special Defense Acquisition Fund: Offsetting collections	-6,000			+ 6,000	
Peacekeeping operations	153,000	134,000	117,900	-35,100	-16,100
Total, title III, Military assistance	4,992,000	3,727,200	3,680,400	-1,311,600	-46,800
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)		(-2,505)
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Financial Institutions					
World Bank Group					
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Global Environment Facility	35,800	175,567	35,800		-139,767
Contribution to the International Development Association	775,000	835,570	576,600	-198,400	-258,970
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency	4,000	16,000	4,900	+ 900	-11,100
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(20,000)	(80,000)	(24,500)	(+ 4,500)	(-55,500)
Total, World Bank Group	814,800	1,027,137	617,300	-197,500	-409,837
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	25,611			-25,611	
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(1,503,719)			(-1,503,719)	
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation	16,000	34,000	8,000	-8,000	-26,000
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund		25,900	10,000	+ 10,000	-15,900
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	41,611	59,900	18,000	-23,611	-41,900
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	13,728			-13,728	
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(672,745)			(-672,745)	
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund	77,000	125,000	72,000	-5,000	-53,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	90,728	125,000	72,000	-18,728	-53,000
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	4,100	6,100	3,100	-1,000	-3,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(64,000)	(95,983)	(49,574)	(-14,426)	(-46,409)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	128,000	100,000	72,000	-56,000	-28,000
Total	132,100	106,100	75,100	-57,000	-31,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	35,779	35,779	35,779		
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)		

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001
(H.R. 4811)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development			5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, International Financial Institutions	1,115,018	1,353,916	823,179	-291,839	-530,737
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(-2,186,390)	(-101,909)
International Organizations and Programs					
Appropriation.....	183,000	354,000	183,000		-171,000
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)		(-2,500)	(-2,500)
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,298,018	1,707,916	1,006,179	-291,839	-701,737
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)		(-2,500)	(-2,500)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(-2,186,390)	(-101,909)
TITLE VI - SOUTHERN AFRICA REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Economic support fund (FY 2000, emergency appropriations)		183,000			-183,000
International disaster assistance:					
FY 2000 emergency appropriations.....		10,000			-10,000
FY 2000 Contingent emergency appropriations.....			160,000	+160,000	+160,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development					
(FY 2000, emergency appropriations)		7,000			-7,000
Total, title VI, FY 2000 emergency appropriation.....		200,000	160,000	+160,000	-40,000
Grand total.....	15,359,935	15,376,557	13,485,463	-1,874,472	-1,891,094
Appropriations.....	(13,534,935)	(15,176,557)	(13,325,463)	(-209,472)	(-1,851,094)
Emergency appropriations.....	(1,825,000)			(-1,825,000)	
FY 2000 emergency appropriations.....		(200,000)	(160,000)	(+160,000)	(-40,000)
(By transfer)	(24,900)	(17,500)	(28,000)	(+3,100)	(+10,500)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)		(-2,505)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(-2,186,390)	(-101,909)
(Loan authorizations).....	(12,964,000)	(17,340,000)	(17,206,700)	(+4,242,700)	(-133,300)
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Total mandatory and discretionary	13,775,935	15,176,557	13,325,463	-450,472	-1,851,094
Mandatory.....	43,837	44,489	44,489	+652	
Discretionary.....	13,732,098	15,132,068	13,280,974	-451,124	-1,851,094

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 2000]
AN UNOBSERVED WAR

Not much notice is paid in the West these days to the war in Chechnya. This is not, as you might think, because the war is over, although Russian officials have declared victory on any number of occasions. It is rather because the facts of the war are inconvenient. Inconvenient for Russia's leaders, who have done everything possible to keep reporters and aid workers from observing the misery there, and inconvenient for U.S. and European leaders, who want to cozy up to Russian President Vladimir Putin.

It's not that the war is a secret. The foreign minister of Chechnya's elected government, who was in Washington a few weeks ago, spoke—to those who would listen; the Clinton administration had little time for him—of the terrible hardship experienced by hundreds of thousands of Chechens rendered homeless by Russian bombs and artillery. Many are trapped in the southern mountains, he said, where most of the fighting now takes place. Chechen and Russian civilians also are often the victims of retaliatory bombings attributed to Chechen fighters. On Sunday, Post correspondents Sharon LaFraniere and Daniel Williams reported on a Russian command post in the Chechen town of Urus-Martan that has become a torture chamber. Many civilians have been raped, brutalized and killed there, according to reliable eyewitness testimony. "They beat us because we are Chechens," a beating victim told the Post.

That reflects the kind of ethnic hatred President Clinton denounced so eloquently, and fought against with such tenacity, in Kosovo. He's had less to say about Russia's assault on the Chechen people. But Mr. Clinton's reticence looks statesmanlike next to the fawning friendship German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder has bestowed on Mr. Putin. This week European Union foreign ministers released \$55 million in aid to Russia that they had frozen last December to protest the war. What's changed since then? The Chechen capital of Grozny is still in ruins, the bombing continues, the Russians have yet to credibly investigate or punish a single case of torture. But the war is no longer on television.

In 10 days Mr. Clinton and other leaders of top industrialized countries will meet with Mr. Putin in Japan at the annual G-8 summit. If the leaders express forceful and public disapproval of Russia's abuses, Mr. Putin might believe there is some cost to continuing human rights violations. If they smile and shake hands as if all is well, they will highlight their own hypocrisy while betraying the hapless Chechens and the few Russian human rights activists campaigning in their behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this legislation before us today. I first want to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), on the manner in which the bill was put together. Unfortunately, because it is seriously deficient in the funding level, and I believe that has resulted in some skewed priorities in the bill, I cannot support it and cannot urge a vote of yes on it.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say for the purpose of starting this debate on

this bill, which everyone knows is a statement of the importance we place on our leadership role in the world, this bill of \$13.3 billion is well below the President's request of \$15.1 billion. The President's request was less than 1 percent of the entire budget. The entire budget is \$1.8 trillion. If we had a pie chart here, this amount in this bill would be just a line, a sliver, a hair, a thread, whatever is smaller, of our national budget. It is just less than 1 percent. Yet the Republican majority could not see fit to meet the President's request, so I must oppose the bill. I will say why.

The bill, I think to make judgment about it we should consider what is the vision of the bill, what is the knowledge it is based on, what is the plan it proposes, how does it respond to the spirit of the American people. I think it fails in every respect.

I am led by President Kennedy's words. Anyone who knows American history knows that in his inaugural address President Kennedy said to the citizens of America, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." Everyone knows that. But everyone does not know that the very next line in that speech, which I heard as a student here in Washington, D.C., in the very next line President Kennedy said to the citizens of the world, "Ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind."

That, I think, should be the vision and the spirit of this legislation, that what we put forward should give some of the benefits of democratization, some economic benefits to these emerging democracies. But this bill does not enable that to happen.

As far as knowledge is concerned, we are blessed in this House of Representatives by the diversity of our membership. Members of our Congressional Black Caucus and of our Hispanic Caucus and the Asian Pacific American Caucus know and understand the cultures and politics of many of the countries that we would hope to cooperate with in this bill. They have been a tremendous intellectual resource to us, and yet we have not listened to them or heeded their call for increased funding, for example, for international debt relief, or increased funding for global AIDS, or other initiatives that we can take to help these countries. It is about cooperation. It is not necessarily about just assistance.

So we have ignored the vision, we have ignored the knowledge, and what is the plan? We have a plan. We have a definite plan. As far as debt relief, for example, is concerned, Jubilee 2000 is an international ecumenical religious and lay community initiative to relieve international debt. Others will talk about the fact that many countries are paying more on their debt

payments than they are on education and health services in their countries. This is a travesty. We should be doing something about it, at the same time as we are not alleviating poverty and we are exacerbating the AIDS crisis.

In addition to the vision, the knowledge, the plan that we are ignoring, we are also ignoring the spirit of the American people, a compassionate people who want to alleviate poverty, stop the starvation of children throughout the world, recognize our interdependence in terms of health issues, infectious diseases and environmental degradation internationally.

So we are ignoring the heart, the head, and the knowledge of this great congress with its diversity, and I think that this is the last time we will ever see a bill that looks like this, because we must assert the influence of our diversity on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his excellent work in developing this bill. He has written an outstanding bill with extremely scarce resources provided to him, and he and his staff have worked very hard to meet the numerous concerns of many Members, including this Member. Since the gentleman from Alabama took over the helm of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, he and his staff have shown great patience in addressing so many of my concerns and those of other subcommittee members, and all of us truly appreciate this. It has been a great pleasure and an honor to serve as a member of his subcommittee and under his outstanding leadership.

In particular, I am pleased with language in this bill and report supporting the furtherance of the peace process among Armenia, Nagorno-Karabagh, and Azerbaijan. The region has been in a fragile state since the tragic event at the Armenian Parliament last October, but it appears that talks have resumed among the parties; and I hold out hope for a peace agreement.

As indicated in the committee's report, I feel that a special negotiator is of critical importance in making progress on the peace process. It is vital that the State Department provide for a long-term special negotiator to follow through on this process. As Presidents Kocharian and Aliyev hopefully resume face-to-face discussions, I hope that the United States will do everything possible to facilitate a lasting peace in this region.

I am grateful, too, for the committee's recommendation concerning Tibet. Tibet remains a desperately poor

region, with the majority of its economic development targeted at the ethnic Chinese residing in the region. It is critically important that programs which support the Tibetans and their culture continue to be funded.

I also support the committee's recommendation of \$15 million for Cyprus. I am encouraged that Mr. Denktas and President Clerides are engaged in talks in New York this month. It is critical that as Turkey's EU candidacy is considered, the reunification of this island nation must be addressed, and the U.S. should continue to work to facilitate peace.

I am also pleased with the committee's continued insistence on limiting Guatemala and Indonesia to expanded-IMET. After the violence which raged in East Timor last fall, the high number of refugees that remain in West Timor and the volatile situation on the island as well as the violence which continues in various regions of Indonesia, it is critical that the United States does not restart military-to-military relations with Indonesia at this time.

I am also pleased as well with the committee's attention and support of environmental and women's issues within the development assistance account.

Finally, I strongly support the committee's funding aid for Israel. It is a critical time in the peace negotiations with respect to Israel and the Middle East, and I believe that it is imperative that the United States continue to support the peace process and provide the environment in which final agreements can be reached.

However, having said all of this, and these items I support very strongly, I am very concerned about the overall funding level. The United States continues to enjoy the strongest economy ever, and yet the money we spend on foreign assistance continues to shrink.

Today our country has arrived at the point of being the strongest, most economically productive nation on Earth, and yet we are shunning strong support and leadership in promoting and supporting our values in other parts of the world. This bill is vastly underfunded. How much more we could do to promote and protect democracy, human rights, the rule of law and free markets with a strong commitment of resources in this area?

Again, however, on the whole, I support the bill and the excellent work of my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). He was presented with a very difficult task, and has succeeded in rising to the challenge.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the foreign operations bill. I just want to speak just a moment on it. In 1992, this bill was \$18 billion, at a time when our country was suffering major deficits. We were funding this bill at \$18 billion and doing a better part as a leader in the world with countries around the world.

The President requested \$15 billion for this 2001 appropriation, and I am sad to say that the bill before us is only \$13.6 billion. We are the leaders of the world. We have a surplus that we never thought we would see, over \$1 trillion over the next decade.

□ 1715

Surely, the leaders of the world, the United States of America, can share, and we want to share our tax dollars with those countries around the world because, as we say all the time, this is a global economy. We can be around the world in two or three clicks. God has blessed our country, and certainly we are in a position today to do better than the low funding that this foreign operations bill brings to us today.

Mr. Chairman, HIV/AIDS. Today in Durbin, South Africa and for the last 5 days, people from around the world have been discussing, how do we attack the pandemic. What must we do to make life available for Africa, for India, and for the former Newly Independent States who are seeing a burst of the illness and disease devastate their families, their countries, and their very being. This bill does not do its part for being the leader in the world. The President recommended \$240 plus million. This bill has much less than that, and it is a travesty. We can do more.

We know now from our own country's experience with HIV and AIDS that prevention and education are the key to keeping the disease in control. We can do better and we ought to do better. Treatment for HIV, we know from our own experience with the disease in our country, that we can treat it, that one can live longer with it. So education, prevention and treatment are available to us. Why, then, is not the richest country in the world doing its part to make sure that we take care of the USA, of course, but also do our part around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee, for his hard work. I want to thank him for sticking with it and making certain of the commitment that he and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee, made to fund Mozambique and that it does include \$160 million, and I appreciate the gentleman's leadership for sticking with it when

sometimes others did not want to stick with it. Mozambique has shown that they are head and shoulders above many other poor countries in the world and that they are doing their part, and I thank the gentleman very much for the appropriation that he has in this bill for Mozambique.

I also want to thank the gentleman for the Phalcon sale, for seeing that it is eliminated. Prime Minister Barak, who is visiting our country today and trying to work out a peace agreement, and we all support peace in the Middle East, has withdrawn that sale, and I think the gentleman's tenacity as well as all of the Members of the Congress have made it possible that that sale has now been rejected and is off the table in our own self-interests and the interests around the world.

Debt relief. There is no reason why we cannot do better with debt relief. Mr. Chairman, \$82 million at a time when we have unparalleled surpluses, we can do better. This is the year of Jubilee. The Bible says that we ought to forgive debt. It has happened over and over again in other times in our existence, in the existence of human beings in this world, and today we can do that as well.

IDA, International Development Assistance, a very important program that we have where we assist other countries in the world. But this bill cuts IDA over \$100 million from last year's appropriation. Over 30 percent of IDA has been cut. We are the leaders of the world. We have been blessed to be born in this country.

I know that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have done their best. We can do better. I urge a no vote on this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to share with my colleagues the procedure that we go through to arrive at this day, and that is, number one, we have a budget resolution and the budget resolution says we must protect Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. We must do certain things, but in order to do that, we cannot outspend a certain level.

So they give to the Committee on Appropriations to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) a designated amount of maximum expenditures that we can appropriate. So the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations then sits down and tries to divide the money in such a fashion that it will be fair to all areas of government, to the housing needs of the people of this country, to the medical needs of the people of this country, to the Defense Department in order that we can have a viable national defense.

When he allocated the money to us, \$13.2 billion, that is as much as we can

spend. All of the rhetoric we hear today, Mr. Chairman, would indicate that we are not doing a responsible job in the division of the money that has been allocated to us. But Mr. Chairman, I think we have done a very responsible job. Each and every request that we got, not only from our Republican colleagues, but from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, each and every request was considered, and a great majority of those requests were granted. We have directed the administration to do exactly what they wanted.

So now they come and say, well, it is not enough money for HIPC, for debt forgiveness for the impoverished nations. Maybe they are right. Maybe it is an insufficient amount of money. But just because President Clinton sends us a message to send \$15 billion, it is not quite that simple, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my colleagues that we have worked with both sides of the aisle, with the gentlewoman from California, with all of the members of the subcommittee, to try to bring to this floor a responsible bill that lives within the allocated funds that have been given to us. I regret that there are not more funds. Maybe they are right. Maybe less than 1 percent of the total budget is an inadequate amount. But we made the decision months ago that we were not going to interfere with Social Security, that we were not going to interfere with the solvency of Medicare, that we were not going to interfere with Medicaid, that we were going to do certain things; and now we have to live with what we decided in March. That is where we are today.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Chicago (Mr. JACKSON), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and other members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations on the work that they have done on this bill. I want to especially thank the chairman and ranking member for working with me in subcommittee to improve some sections of the bill with respect to Africa and those countries that are not as fortunate as the United States. However, if the U.S. is to maintain its position as a global leader, we ought to act like one and assist those countries that are most in need.

We should create opportunities and spread stability throughout the world by combating infectious disease and poverty and working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization and fostering the conditions for economic

growth; that is in our national interests.

However, this year's budget for this bill for which the chairman just spoke is below the President's request and below the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. Moreover, I am deeply disappointed and disturbed that this subcommittee did not get more money to help demonstrate its leadership abroad, especially in some of the accounts that fund Africa and Latin America.

In this bill, Africa would receive about \$97 million less than last year and \$267 million less than the President's request. In percentage terms, funds for Africa are cut by 14.6 percent, while the overall cut to this bill is 10 percent below the President's request. Africa does receive funds from other accounts like the Economic Support Fund, the Foreign Military Financing, the International Monetary and Education and Training, and Debt Relief. However, inclusion of those figures would show a greater reduction from the request as cuts have been made in all of those accounts.

While the overall request has been reduced by 10 percent, the amounts requested to address the problems of debt relief in Africa and Latin America, the spread of HIV/AIDS in Asia and Africa, poverty alleviation and access to family planning have been cut disproportionately.

Consider this: the bill contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million in pending requests for debt relief and a moratorium for countries who receive debt relief from obtaining new loans. It will not even provide enough resources to enable two countries, Bolivia and Mozambique, who have all met necessary conditions to obtain debt relief. On Monday, the Wall Street Journal said, "One year after President Clinton and other world leaders vowed to write off \$50 billion in debt owed by deserving poor nations, that effort is in danger of collapsing, largely because Congress, this subcommittee, has not paid the share of the U.S. tab." That is quite disgraceful.

The bill contains only \$202 million of the \$244 million requested to combat HIV/AIDS. The staggering impact of this disease on health and development of affected nations has made it imperative that the U.S. provide more resources to combat the pandemic. In fact, so serious is the AIDS crisis in Africa that the U.S. has declared it a national security threat.

The bill before us reduces funding for lending to poor countries by drastically cutting funding for the International Development Association, the African Development Bank and Fund, and the Asian Development Fund by 32 percent below the requested levels.

Overall cuts to all programs in the bill which benefit Africa and Latin America are 15 percent.

The \$541 million requested for family planning programs has been cut to \$385

million, which is 29 percent below requested levels. The bill also contains objectionable language on the Mexico City policy, which seeks to impose undemocratic restrictions on foreign organizations.

Recently, Congress passed, and the President signed, a bill signaling a new relationship with Africa. To make this relationship a reality, we need to put our money where our mouth is. Additional funding needs to be made and provided for the African Development Fund and the African Development Bank and the Development Fund, for Africa needs to be made into a separate development assistance account.

Many nations on the continent of Africa are making unprecedented progress towards democratic rule and open markets, and with the Development Fund for Africa included as a separate account, funding would be assured to remain focused on the long-term problems and development priorities of our African partners.

Although there have been many concerns in the past about management of the African Development Bank, I know that strides have been made. I feel it is unwise to completely underfund the bank at this time when they are working diligently to address the management problems. I am encouraged that the African Development Fund received an allocation, however.

Mr. Chairman, in turning our attention to some of the more important regions of the world, we should not turn our back on others.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not have before me the percentage of increase that we have provided for the continent of Africa during my tenure as chairman of this committee, but I would remind the gentleman from Illinois that this year, we appropriate more than \$1.5 billion for sub-Saharan Africa. I think that under the circumstances of the limited allocation we have, and in response, a great deal, to the request that the gentleman from Illinois has made, that we have provided to sub-Saharan Africa a sufficient amount. I wish we had more, but we do not have more.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, with great respect for our chair and our ranking member, who both wish they had more for this bill, frankly, I rise in disbelief that we are here, once again, debating a foreign aid bill that is woefully underfunded. Whatever the reason, this bill, like just about every other House version of the foreign operations bills since 1995, is the epitome of myopic neglect. With a few notable exceptions, the bill underfunds almost every aspect of United States foreign aid. It is \$1.5 billion less than the

President's request; it undercuts our contribution to IDA, the arm of the World Bank that makes loans to the poorest of poor nations; it practically ignores the AIDS crisis in Africa that is plunging that continent further into economic and social despair every day; and it adds insult to injury by undercutting the President's debt relief initiative. And, once again, it violates fundamental principles of democracy by imposing a malicious gag rule on foreign NGOs participating in a bilateral family planning program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we discuss for a moment why a strong United States foreign aid program is so critical, because it is very clear to me there is a misunderstanding in this Chamber on that point. The single most important argument for a stronger investment in foreign AID in this time of great prosperity and burgeoning budget surpluses is that we have a responsibility to help those who have been left behind.

In the Jewish faith, we call it "tikkun olam," which means, repairing the world. What it means is that we recognize that if we were suffering under the scourge of a 20, 25 percent HIV infection rate or experiencing such a high level of infant mortality that we all knew someone who lost a child or could not send our daughters to primary school because only the boys were allowed to go to school, and even they could only go for a few years, that we would expect, and rightfully so, that other more fortunate nations around the world would help alleviate some of this suffering, and we, in turn, are bound by that same obligation.

□ 1730

I was brought up believing that the right thing to do is to repair the world, to help those who need it. Sadly, this bill takes that principle and throws it out the window.

But there is another reason why such a low level of foreign assistance is terribly misguided, a more selfish reason. That is because in the long run we in the United States will reap the benefits from the stability sown by our aid.

Countries that are now top candidates for foreign assistance can use our aid to strengthen their democracy, stabilize their economies, and improve the health and well-being of their citizens. When these goals are met and these countries become strong and independent, they will graduate from being recipients of our aid to being our strategic allies and trading partners. So it makes sense for us, it makes sense for them.

In the last year of World War II, Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave his fourth inaugural address to the Nation. As the war raged and some people suggested that we ought not to be involved in the affairs of other nations, FDR made a profound case for the impor-

tance of the United States' engagement around the world. I think his words are particularly relevant today.

He said: "We have learned that we cannot live alone at peace, that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men and not as ostriches, not as dogs in the manger. We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community."

FDR's words from 55 years ago ring even truer today. We cannot turn our backs on the people of the world. It is in our interests to promote economic stability and democracy.

Reluctantly, I will vote for this bill today because I do not believe that the Republican leadership in the House will produce a better bill. I do believe that this bill will look a lot different, a lot better, when it comes back to this floor after conference.

I am telling the Republican leadership today that I refuse to play their game. I want to move the bill off the floor to the conference, of which I will be a member as soon as possible. As the most powerful Nation in the world, we have the capacity and the responsibility to improve the lives of those less fortunate. We cannot turn away from that obligation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), a member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, who is very knowledgeable about the world debt issue and a great leader on that issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am enormously proud as a Jew at this moment of the government of Israel and Ehud Barak. We are seeing on the part of the government of Israel an enormous outreach unlike what any victor in a war has ever done towards those it was forced to fight.

I am therefore pleased that this bill funds at the requested level money for those who are trying to make peace in the Middle East.

Precisely for that reason, I am very sad that I must morally vote against the bill. I am confident that in the end a bill will pass which will fund fully the needs of those in the Middle East, including Israel and this enormously courageous leadership of Ehud Barak.

But I do not see how we can be asked to vote for a bill which at this point condemns countless hundreds of thousands of innocent children to death by starvation and disease which is avoidable.

We debate often in this Chamber about measures, the outcomes of which we cannot be sure. We debate about things which can be uncertain, things which are complex. Sometimes things are simple and important. Millions of

children and other vulnerable people in Africa and Latin America and in Asia, in the poorest countries in the world, literally the poorest countries in the world, go without food, go without sanitation, go without basic medical costs, partly because of policies for which we are responsible, because in the exigencies of the Cold War we lent money to thugs and crooks, unconcerned about how they spent it.

Now the poorest people in the world, poor children and poor elderly and sick people, are being made to pay that back. The price of their paying it back is absolute, unrelenting, degrading poverty leading to death.

In this Nation, the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world, we are creating wealth at a pace unparalleled in the history of the world. A relatively small amount of money in terms of this budget, several hundred million dollars, could alleviate untold sufferings.

For this House, with the money we spend in so many other places, for us to deny to the poorest people in the world the debt relief which the administration has asked for and which has been worked out is the cruelest single act of public policy I can recall in 20 years.

I implore the House not to ratify this most callous refusal to alleviate untold sufferings, which we could do.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I might just briefly respond, Mr. Chairman, and remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that during my tenure as chairman of this committee we have created the child survival account, which this year contains more than \$800 million to do precisely what the gentleman from Massachusetts wants.

We have no problem with the destination that the gentleman seeks. It is like standing in this room and saying we want to get to that corner. The gentleman thinks maybe we ought to go to the left, which is the gentleman's party's view. I think that maybe we should go to the right.

But we are trying to do precisely the same thing, and that is what the child survival account does, it provides for starving children, it provides for the sick, it provides educational opportunities in these poor countries. It does it directly, primarily through private volunteer organizations, not going through some dictator or corrupt president. It does it precisely the right way.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the gentleman that debt relief is an important part of that because otherwise the money goes in one pot and out the other.

For all of the volunteer organizations which the gentleman cites and which I am glad he is working with, for all of them, their highest priority is the debt relief, which is unfunded in this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if they understood that the only way we could get the money under the allocation would be to take it away from the monies we are giving to them, they would change their minds.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that there are many deficiencies with this bill, particularly the ones that have been cited by some of my Democratic colleagues: the lack of adequate funding for debt relief, the lack of adequate funding for AIDS, the 32 percent below requested funding for development in Asia and Africa, family planning cut 29 percent below requested levels.

We are acting as if we have to enact an austerity budget, and perhaps that was dictated by the budget resolution, in a time of huge and unprecedented surpluses.

These considerations would ordinarily lead me to say we ought to vote against the bill. But this bill comes at a particular time right now. This bill comes at a time when there are very sensitive negotiations which may determine whether there is major warfare in the Middle East or whether a peace agreement finally ends the 100 Years War.

The aid for Israel and Egypt is locked into this bill. I very much fear that if this House today were to vote against this bill, it would send the wrong signal to the Palestinian negotiators, a signal of wavering support for Israel which might make the Palestinian negotiators even more rigid and less willing to make the necessary compromises to reach a peaceful settlement than they have thus far shown themselves to be.

The Israelis have shown themselves willing to make very far-reaching compromises. So far the Palestinians have been rigid. They have to make compromise positions if there is going to be an agreement and not an explosion.

For that reason, I do not want to send the wrong signal to them that could be misunderstood as wavering support for Israel. Therefore, I will vote for this bill today, but I want to make it very clear that if the deficiencies in funding for the Asian and African family planning and other accounts are not fixed as this bill goes through the conference, I may very well vote against the conference report when it comes back here. If the President should decide that he has to veto this bill, I will certainly vote to sustain the veto.

But today, with the Camp David negotiations going on, today is the wrong

time to send a signal that could be misinterpreted and that could deleteriously affect the chances for peace in the Middle East. Today I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, for the moment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the very distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I see things quite differently than the gentleman who just spoke. What I find amazing about this bill is that just the increase in the budget for the Department of Defense over the last 18 months, just the increase, is larger than the entire foreign aid assistance bill which we are debating today.

Foreign aid as a percentage of our national budget is less than 1 percent. This bill fully meets our responsibilities to our national interests in the Middle East. We understand that. The problem is that we are not a third-rate power who only has to worry about one part of the world. We have obligations to our interests in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America, as well as the Middle East.

While this bill is a full policy for the Middle East, it shreds our ability to defend our interests in Latin America, in Africa, and to a lesser extent, in Asia. For that reason, it would be a horrendous mistake for us to vote for this bill until we have met our responsibilities to ourselves in each of the regions of the world.

It would also be a mistake to vote for this bill until we provide a recognition of reality through debt relief. Debt relief is no great gift that we are going to be giving to the Third World, these are debts that are totally uncollectible. They were incurred by governments that were national disgraces and international jokes.

We gave debt relief to the tune of billions of dollars to the new regime in Poland because we understood that was the only way for that economy to revive, for that society to revive after the communists had run that country into the ditch.

The same is true many times over for many of these African and Latin American countries. We will never have markets for our own products in Africa, in Latin America, until we create the same economic conditions that we created in Eastern Europe through debt relief that was provided there.

This country has also provided very large debt forgiveness for Israel, it has provided very large debt relief for Egypt. Now we are being asked to treat the poorest countries in the world, the same countries who have no capacity to pay back that debt, the same way. If we do not act, we will assure even greater numbers of deaths through the pandemic problem of AIDS that we now face on the continent of Africa.

We need to get real. Eventually we will, and when we do, this bill will be worth supporting. Until then, because of the limitations imposed on the committee, it does not contain the resources necessary for us to defend either our interests or our moral obligations around this planet.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill. I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Although I understand and share the concerns of many of my Democratic colleagues, such as the level of debt relief or lack thereof, the global gag rule, the lack of funding for HIV-AIDS, and the funding shortfall in general, despite all that, I feel that it is important to keep this legislation moving forward and address these concerns in a House-Senate conference.

There are a number of important initiatives in this legislation which I requested and that are critical to U.S. security. This legislation includes a \$5.4 million increase for the International Fund for Ireland, and a recommendation that Project Children receive \$250,000 to help support their good works.

I would also like to thank the committee for including \$10 million for microbicide research.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee for working with me to include language urging Arab states to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel.

I would like to extend my gratitude to the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for assisting me in including these initiatives.

While I support this legislation, I would ask that the chairman address the concerns raised by my colleagues and myself when this legislation goes to conference. We will all be watching to see that additional funding is added. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

Although I understand and share the concerns of many of my Democratic colleagues, I feel that it is important to keep this legislation moving forward and address these concerns in a House-Senate Conference.

I, too, am concerned about the low level of funding for debt relief for the heavily indebted poor countries, the low level of funding for international infectious diseases, especially HIV/AIDS, and I am especially concerned about the low overall funding level of this legislation, which is about twelve percent less than the President's request.

Like many of my colleagues, I am also unhappy that the so called compromise language from last year's Omnibus legislation placing a "gag rule" on international healthcare providers was included in this legislation. This language represents an unnecessary rider, which the Republican leadership stated should not be included in appropriations bills. I will speak more on this issue when it is debated later.

However, there are a number of important initiatives in this legislation, which I requested, and that are critical to US security.

I would like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN, Ranking Member NANCY PELOSI, and Representative LOWEY for assisting me in including these important initiatives.

This legislation includes a \$5.4 million increase for the International Fund for Ireland (IFI). The IFI was established as an independent, international organization 1986 and receives contributions from the United States, the European Union, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The objectives of the Fund are to promote economic and social advance and to encourage contact, dialogue and reconciliation between Unionists and Nationalists in the North of Ireland and the border counties of the Republic of Ireland.

This funding is of critical importance at this juncture in the Northern Ireland Peace Process.

Additionally, the Committee has included a recommendation that Project Children receive \$250,000 to help support their work. Project Children brings Irish children from a range of ages to spend six weeks in the U.S. Sometimes a Protestant child joins a Catholic child in the same home with remarkably positive results. In addition, the program brings college students to the United States through its "Young Leaders" program and places them in internship positions in local organizations. A number of U.S. Representatives have taken Project Children Young Leader interns into their offices and homes.

With these additional funds, the true benefits of a lasting peace in the North of Ireland, economic prosperity and equal opportunity, will receive a much-needed boost.

I would also like to thank the Committee for including \$10 million for microbicide research and instructing USAID to work in consultation with the National Institutes of Health to ensure microbicide research and development takes into consideration the special circumstances of drug delivery in developing nations.

As many of you know, microbicides are user-controlled products that kill or inactivate the bacteria and viruses that cause STD's and HIV/AIDS and would fill a gap in the range of prevention tools because they are woman-controlled and could protect against various STD's, not just HIV. Microbicide products, it is hoped, will provide women in developing countries with a cheap, effective alternative to prevent the spread of STD's. Issues such as a lack of refrigeration, cultural and educational barriers, and a lack of access to medical facilities need to be considered carefully if microbicides are used effectively in developing nations. This funding will help ensure the special needs of developing nations are met with respect to microbicide research.

I would also like to thank the Committee for working with me to include language updating

the Arab League Boycott language, urging Arab states to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel. Israel has existed for more than 50 years and has earned the right to be treated as a full member of the international community.

Once again, I would like to extend my gratitude to Chairman CALLAHAN, Ranking Member PELOSI and to my good friend Congresswoman LOWEY for their assistance, as well as the rest of the Committee.

While I will support this legislation, I ask that you address the concerns raised by my colleagues and myself when this legislation goes to Conference.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the co-chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus.

□ 1745

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for yielding me the time and for her leadership on this bill and on some of the issues before this Congress.

This bill vastly underfunds the AIDS prevention program and debt relief for the world's poorest countries and undermines our commitment to international family planning.

The President pledged a multiyear U.S. commitment for debt relief, which this bill guts. It also drastically underfunds international family planning 30 percent below the President's request. Every day we in government face problems for which there is no solution, like global warming, the AIDS crisis, Parkinson's disease, but family planning presents a different challenge, we know what to do.

Mr. Chairman, we know what the answer is, all we need is the funds and the political will to get the job done. Increasing international family planning to the President's request by 30 percent more would allow 11.7 million more couples to have access to family planning. It would also mean 2.2 million fewer abortions, and it would save the lives of more than 15,000 women and 92,000 infants.

Earlier this year, many of us introduced a bill called Saving Women's Lives Through International Family Planning, we had over 122 cosponsors. We asked this Congress to go "Back to the Future," back to 1995 funding levels for family planning and meet the budget requests of the President. We asked for this money without restrictions.

Gag rules are enough to make us gag in our own country. The gag rule would be unconstitutional around the world. It is unconscionable.

This budget before us is far short of going back to the future. This bill also exports one of the worst policies, the gag rule language that is unconstitutional in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in a bipartisan effort to strike

this terrible antidemocratic, antiwoman, antifairness language, the gag rule out of the bill, it hurts some of the poorest women and countries in the world.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from California (Ms. PELOSI) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I will be offering a bipartisan amendment on behalf of the gentleman from New York, (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), to plus up by \$15 million the microenterprise loans for the poor. This will be offset with \$15 million in cuts.

We will probably hear some screams and some squeals from the bureaucrats or from big business, but I think we have a moral obligation to hear the cries of the poor of those in poverty, of those in Third World nations where the microenterprise loan for the poor of \$16 or \$60 can lift people out of poverty.

I hope my colleagues will vote for this for three reasons: One, these programs work. Secondly, they go to people in poverty, mostly women. Thirdly, they go to start small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can pass this to get this \$15 million up to the approved authorization level.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for yielding the time to me and ask my colleagues to look back at the oath of office they took when they were sworn in here.

Mr. Chairman, it speaks of all the enemies, foreign and domestic. It says we need to fully discharge our duties. And in the Constitution, it talks about our defense and general welfare.

I would submit to the body that if we pass this bill, we are doing neither; that our responsibilities here not simply out of the goodness of our heart and concern for the poorest people on this planet is not being met by this legislation, but what is in the best interests of the security of the United States is not being met. Whether it is the fight for AIDS and the opportunistic illness that has come to this country for people infected with AIDS in Africa and elsewhere, that come back in and not only takes the lives of Americans, but also increases the costs of the cure; TB that could once be cured for \$2,000 per case is now \$20,000 or \$200,000 in some cases.

Together we need to reject this bill so that we fully discharge our responsibilities so this great Nation can do the job that it must do for all the people in this world that look to us for leadership and for the American citizenry who depend on our responsibilities here to do a job that protects them, that furthers America's interests in every continent, not simply in one region of the world.

We need to do what is right. I know the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) understands that. The only way to get to that point is to join the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and reject this proposal and force this institution to address the responsibilities fully as our oath demands.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) who has been a leader in the fight against global AIDS.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for her leadership and commend her for the continued effort and tenacity in trying to make sure that we have a fairness on this floor in terms of our services to foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, leadership is the operative word here today, and because of that, I will say to this body, if we are leaders, then please lead. Be leaders and be responsible for those things that we were sent here to do. It is unconscionable to me to see the most powerful country in this world reneging on children and women.

Some of the poorest countries in this world are suffering and here we are opposing the administration budget for \$244 million for HIV and AIDS. It is a pandemic in Africa; we know that. You knew that. We know the 50 million people who have been infected with HIV and AIDS.

Why is it that my colleagues are minimizing the efforts that have been brought about with people throughout Africa in trying to combat this very critical infectious disease? I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. It is unconscionable. It is immoral. It is inconceivable.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation for the hard work of the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), I am displeased with what has come.

Mr. Chairman, I fully respect what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done in portions of this bill. I fully understand why it is important

to support the Middle East and the peace deliberations. But we cannot afford to come here day after day and ignore the poorest people of the world, while we have a pandemic going on in Africa and Asia with AIDS. If we think that is going to stay in Africa, we are in for rude awakenings.

The life expectancy is moving to year 30. Can my colleagues imagine any country, any nation that has a life expectancy of 30, and we are willing to walk away and simply say we just do not have the money when we know that we do?

We can save Social Security. We can do the right thing about Medicare prescription drugs and still send some aid, the appropriate aid as frugal as is requested by the President, and we have ignored that. Let us vote against this and do it right.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is a saying in the church that I go to "to whom much is given, much is required." This is supposed to be the greatest Nation, the most affluent Nation on the face of the planet Earth, in the history of the planet Earth. Yet, why is it when it comes to us delivering to those who need the most, we find excuses not to do it.

When I heard the distinguished chair, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) talking in his opening statements, I heard excuses of why we could not help those who need help. People in this House have traveled to Africa, and when they go to Africa they say, oh, what a shame, how bad it is, oh, this is pitiful. Yet when it comes time when we can do something about it, and foreign operations is that time, we find excuses not to do anything about it.

It is time that we stop making excuses, put our money where our mouths are and do the right thing and give the money where it is needed and that is in the continent of Africa.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and also our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for crafting this bill. They have had a difficult task.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned with the overall deep cuts to the bill and the disproportionately hurt African and Latin American countries, and I hope that when we send this bill to conference, we can fix some of that.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for implementing legislation I introduced last year about Professor Doan Viet Hoat. A journalist and university professor, Mr. Hoat spent nearly a third of his life in a Vietnamese prison for his

efforts to bring freedom of the press and democracy to his native land.

It is a rare individual who is willing to sacrifice their own personal freedom for the sake of their fellow man, and when we find such a person, it is important for us in Congress to acknowledge and recognize their achievement and the purpose of their struggle.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy and a champion on international debt relief.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the terrific work that she has done as the ranking member. She has taken on a tremendous responsibility and helped to organize us all. The foreign operations appropriations bill is scandalously underfunded.

The entire region of sub-Saharan Africa has been ignored and abandoned by the Republican leadership in this bill. The African Development Bank's funding was cut by almost 25 percent below its current funding level and 50 percent below the administration's request.

The African Development Fund was cut 28 percent below its current level and \$56 million below the administration's request. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Banking Committee, I know how important these programs are.

Development assistance programs that benefit Africa have also been underfunded. International disaster system was cut from \$203 million to \$165 million, barely a few months after floods ravaged Southern Africa. I am especially outraged by the lack of funding for debt relief.

The bill contains only \$82.4 million for debt relief with only \$69.4 million of which can be used to forgive the debt of the world's poorest countries. While HIV/AIDS epidemic continues to ravish sub-Saharan Africa; while the impoverished nation of Mozambique attempts to rebuild itself after it was nearly destroyed by devastating floods; while Nigeria scuttles to overcome the impact of years of dictatorship; while Tanzania, Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda continue to spend more of their budgets on debt service payments than they do on health and education combined, the Republican leadership is turning a deaf ear.

□ 1800

Shame on the failed Republican leadership.

It is hard for me to imagine how Members of Congress who claimed to be faithful, God-fearing leaders of families and communities can reject the most impoverished and vulnerable people in the world.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this shameful bill, send it down the drain. Do not vote for it. It is outrageous.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is a senior member on the Committee on International Relations to close.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. This bill will significantly hamper our ability to compete in the international community. Unfortunately, this budget provides inadequate resources for discretionary investments.

I am very concerned about the Africa accounts which cuts the African Development Fund, the Development Fund for Africa, the Africa Development Bank, and the Peacekeeping Initiatives.

The bill underfunds the office of transition initiatives in Nigeria. It cuts economic support funds by \$2.3 billion, international debt reduction by \$180 million, African Development Bank by \$3 million, HIV/AIDS under Child Survival by \$42 million, and Peacekeeping to Sierra Leone, Congo and Eritrea-Ethiopia by \$16 million.

Presently there is a meeting going on in Durban, South Africa, hosted by President Mbeki, where one out of four individuals in certain countries may die from AIDS. This bill reduces the global alliance for vaccines and immunizations by 25 percent. It is wrong. It is shameful. We should reject this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me start off by telling the Chair what a magnificent job he has done for the last several years in presiding over this Committee of the Whole. He is a complement to the system, and certainly his understanding of the rules and procedure and his manner helps make a very difficult job a little bit easier.

Under the rules of our side, this will be my last year as chairman of this committee. This is the sixth time I have come before this body and asked for their support in a bill that I have drafted. It is sort of sad in a way that I leave it. On the other hand, I am optimistically looking forward to the hope that the chairman of our full committee will award me a cardinalship of another committee, one that probably will not be as difficult as this one has been.

But during this process, Mr. Chairman, Charlie Flickner, John Shank, Chris Walker, Nancy Tippins, Lori Maes, and Julie Schechter on my side of the aisle have been invaluable.

Before I became chairman, I was a member of this subcommittee. But I will assure my colleagues that I knew very little because, back then, the gen-

tleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was the ranking Democrat and chairman of this subcommittee, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Livingston) was the ranking Republican, and I was the back bencher who was not allowed hardly to say anything. But on the other hand, I did not want to say anything.

So I had not done my homework, and suddenly one morning I woke up as chairman of this very important committee. So the educational process that these great individual staffers have given to me is invaluable, and I am extremely indebted to them.

Not only to those staff people on my side of the aisle, but on the other side of the aisle, Mark Murray and John Stivers as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have been extremely courteous to me during this entire process.

We have had great differences. We are having great differences tonight. But nevertheless, there has always been the true friendship that now exists between me and the staff members on both the Republican side and the Democratic side as well as my subcommittee members and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my ranking member of the subcommittee.

It has been an interesting trip, and I think that we ought to go ahead and expedite this trip. Maybe during all of these opportunities we have to praise each other, we might even agree to some unanimous consent to limit debate since I think I have written the perfect bill. If we could just limit debate, all the Members could go home.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

I want to speak for my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his leadership as chair of this subcommittee. While we may not have always agreed on the particular priorities, he has always been a gentleman and has always welcomed our input into the process.

I know that, at the end of this bill, and as we come back with the conference report, if we do, there will be more time for us to praise him and wish him well, as the ranking member of some other committee perhaps. That was a joke, Mr. Chairman.

In any event, in addition to all of the very fine staff that was acknowledged, who are acknowledged by the chairman, I want to add Beth Titter, Charles Dujon, Kim Rudolph, Alan Dillingham, and Will Painter for their fine service to this process as well and associate myself with the remarks that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) made about the other

staff members and how dependent we are in a very bipartisan way on their service.

But I think I have the best chairman on the Committee on Appropriations, and he and the big chairman have always dealt fairly with us. We are going to miss the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I know we will see the gentleman from Alabama somewhere else along the way, so I wanted to commend him in that spirit.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I suppose the appropriate thing to say is I am going to miss the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), too; but I do not know that I really am going to miss her in this capacity. But I do appreciate what she has given to me in the form of friendship, in the form of intelligence, the great contributions she has made.

I am sort of like the country singer David Allan Coe. Once he said he had thought he had written the perfect song. The gentlewoman from California says there will be an opportunity for us to praise each other sometime later on in the process, but I, like David Allan Coe, think that I have written the perfect bill. I think there is a good possibility that the Senate may just accept my bill, Mr. Chairman, and there might not be a conference; and, therefore, we will not have these opportunities.

But, nevertheless, to our colleagues who are listening, as we go into the rest of this bill, I would encourage my colleagues to look at what we have done, and that is, the fact that we have drafted the best bill that we possibly could draft under the circumstances of the allocations that forced this to this point.

I know there are some people who differ from me. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) a few minutes ago was talking about a lack of attention to Latin America. Surely she jests because, under my chairmanship, we have quadrupled assistance to Latin America. Just in the last 3 years, we have given them nearly \$3 billion.

I had to fight this administration tooth and nail, with the support from the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. PELOSI) to get them to recognize that another country exists in this hemisphere other than Haiti. We even put restrictions in our bills saying one can spend all the money one wants in Haiti, but one has to spend 10 times that amount in other countries in Latin America.

So we have been the biggest supporters of Latin America trying to pound into the head of this administration the importance of our neighbors to the south. I think they have finally

come around, and they are finally beginning to recognize that assistance to Latin America and South America is just as important as it is to the Middle East and to Africa.

So we have done a great deal of good, I think, towards convincing this administration that other countries exist in this hemisphere that need assistance such as Bolivia, Honduras, Nicaragua, all of the Latin American countries.

I am proud that we have brought to this floor a bill which reflects the best that can be arranged for the allocation we have. I would encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Committee for maintaining strong conditions on U.S. military aid for Indonesia based on the situation in East Timor. I would particularly like to recognize and thank the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Mrs. PELOSI, for her leadership and actions in support of the people of East Timor.

I also applaud Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for increasing to \$25 million the amount of Economic Support Funds (ESF) targeted for the rebuilding of East Timor. I also hope that the United States will continue its policy of consulting directly with the communities and people of East Timor on reconstruction projects and employing, to the maximum extent possible, East Timor on reconstruction projects and employing, to the maximum extent possible, East Timorese in these projects.

Like so many of the colleagues, however, I remain deeply concerned about the situation in East Timor. More than 100,000 refugees from East Timor who were forcibly removed from their country in December 1999 remain trapped in squalid camps in the neighboring Indonesian province of West Timor. They suffer daily intimidation, harassment and acts of violence from the Indonesian-supported militias that control the camps. International humanitarian organizations, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR), have been forced to abandon their work in many of these camps because of acts of violence perpetrated by against their workers.

Also disturbing are the continuing cross-border attacks being carried out by the Indonesian-supported militias. Based and freely operating in the Indonesian province of West Timor, militias launch attacks against East Timor and against the United Nations peacekeeping forces in East Timor. These attacks must stop. The militias must be disarmed. And West Timor must cease being a safe haven for these paramilitary forces.

The Government of Indonesia has pledged to improve conditions in the camps and, for any refugee who wishes to return, to guarantee their safe return. It has pledged to remove the militias from the camps and stop the cross-border attacks. To date, these pledges are just empty words. They have not translated into concrete actions on the ground in West Timor. Until these refugees are safely returned to their homeland, the U.S. must maintain restrictions on U.S. military aid and

the Administration must maintain its suspension on all military-to-military relations. The Government of Indonesia and its Armed Forces, in particular, must understand the safe return of these refugees is among our highest priorities.

I am deeply disturbed to hear that the Administration wishes to resume military-to-military relations with the Armed Forces of Indonesia (TNI). While conditions are worsening for the East Timorese refugees in West Timor, the Administration wants to include TNI officers and troops in training exercises, military seminars, college courses, and to provide spare parts and other technical assistance for Indonesian military equipment. I can only urge the Administration, in the strongest possible terms, to refrain from taking such actions unless it wishes to see the restrictions in this bill expanded to prohibit by law such military relations.

My distinguished colleague, Congressman CHRISTOPHER SMITH of New Jersey, and I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4357, the East Timor Repatriation and Security Act, which, among other things, would prohibit by law the military relations voluntarily suspended by the Administration in September 1999. Our bill currently has over 50 bipartisan cosponsors. We introduced our bill because we were increasingly concerned about the deteriorating situation of the refugees in West Timor; the continuing militia attacks along the West Timor and East Timor border; and the lack of consultation with, participation by and employment of East Timorese in reconstruction projects. I am fully prepared to continue to press for greater action on these issues as the foreign operations appropriations bill moves toward conference.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important that the bilateral and multilateral aid going to East Timor reach the people on the ground more quickly. I have heard nothing but good things about USAID projects in East Timor. We consult with the East Timorese people. Our reconstruction projects employ local workers, thus contributing to the rehabilitation of the local economy and the restoration of work and dignity to the East Timorese. But a great deal of the assistance is not showing up in the building of new homes and businesses, in the restoration of water systems, in electricity hookups and schools being reopened. Where is it going? I don't know, Mr. Chairman, but it certainly is not reaching the communities and people of East Timor.

I hope the State Department and our representatives at the multilateral development banks and at the United Nations will press our allies to fulfill their commitments to provide assistance for East Timor. I hope our representatives and aid workers will press our allies and the NGOs involved in rebuilding East Timor to accelerate reconstruction projects and to make sure aid reaches those who need it most, rather than resting in the pockets of consultants and high-salaried international officials.

I was in East Timor shortly before the historic referendum on independence, which means I was also there shortly before the horrific outbreak of violence that devastated the country. The international community and we in the United States promised the people of East Timor that we would support them in

their quest for freedom and independence should they choose it at the ballot box. So far, we have only let them down. Many of them have died because we did not keep our word. For all East Timorese, their lives have changed for the worse with the physical destruction of their homes, businesses and communities and the separation of families.

We must do better in the future. This bill maintains the promise by this Congress to hold accountable those who destroyed East Timor and who forcibly removed the majority of the population from their homes. We in Congress must also hold the Administration accountable and ensure that the suspension on military-to-military relations is sustained. And we must remain committed to the rebuilding of East Timor and the ongoing process to bring full independence to this tiny but courageous country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before us. I am particularly disappointed that it allocates only a paltry amount of money to aid and assist Lebanon at a time when significant events have transpired in that country in recent months.

In May, Israel withdrew the last of its troops from south Lebanon. Prime Minister Barak made a wise decision to withdraw from the country his troops had occupied since 1977; it will do much to improve the prospects of negotiating future peace accords in the Middle East. The Administration has rewarded Israel for its withdrawal, stating that \$50 million of Israel's aid package for the coming year will go to assist Israel as it redeploys its forces along the Lebanese border. I do not oppose this proposal. I would note, however, that Israel's total aid and assistance package provided by the bill before us is \$2.9 billion. Including Wye funds allocated through the supplemental appropriation, Israel will receive \$4.1 billion this year.

Mr. Chairman, Lebanon is in dire need of assistance. The bill before us provides only \$18 million to Lebanon, which is an improvement over last year's figure, but is woefully insufficient considering the changes that have taken place in Lebanon. This spring alone, an estimated \$85 million in damage was inflicted on Lebanese infrastructure as a result of Israeli attacks. Lebanon has endured a prolonged civil war, foreign occupation, and an influx of refugees. The Lebanese government must have the ability to rebuild infrastructure damage earlier this year, reestablish order and the rule of law by civilian authorities in south Lebanon, and prevent further bloodshed from occurring along the Lebanese-Israeli border. I believe a six-year, \$300 million aid package would be appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, Metro Detroit is the home of nearly 220,000 Arab Americans, many of Lebanese descent. Many have come to the United States since 1975, seeking to escape the mayhem that so long gripped Lebanon. And though these recent Lebanese immigrants have become an integral part of Southeast Michigan, they maintain a passionate love of their homeland. They are hopeful that Lebanon will continue its efforts, begun at the close of the civil war in 1990, to rebuild and reclaim its place as a regional leader in finance and commerce.

Disputes between the Lebanese government and Israel, and numerous militias in

south Lebanon and Israel, are still unresolved. However, without stability in Lebanon, peace is impossible, and without peace or stability it is likely that renewed violence along the Lebanese-Israeli border will occur.

Peace comes at a price, yet building a lasting, comprehensive peace in the Middle East is a key foreign policy goal of our country. American assistance to Lebanon at this time would be a wise investment and work toward fulfilling this goal. Clearly, Lebanon, a long-troubled country, must be stable if a lasting peace is ever to take root across the Middle East.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify for the record that the bill language on Kyoto, in Section 577 of this bill, which was crafted in a bipartisan manner by my colleagues, myself, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG, is in fact identical to the provision adopted on appropriations bills for Energy and Water and Agriculture, and essentially the same as the provision on the VA/HUD and CJS bills.

However, I would like to clarify for the record that some additional characterizations of the provision, both in remarks made on the floor during deliberation of the Agriculture appropriations bill, and as submitted to the record on that bill, are not correct. They are in direct conflict with the bipartisan agreement that was crafted, and more importantly, with the statutory language which is now in the Agricultural Appropriations bill and the other bills I have listed, including the bill, Foreign Operations.

The assertion that activities allowed under the language must be specifically authorized is incorrect. In fact, that is not what the language says. The language says that activities otherwise authorized by law are not subjected to any of the restrictions that may be imposed by the Kyoto proviso. There are many activities that the Administration engages in that fall within generally authorized activities—activities that are supported and funded by Congress in a bipartisan fashion.

These types of activities include negotiations, both formal and informal, for instance—and many energy-saving programs that benefit consumers and the economy. Some Members on the other side of the aisle stated they have no intention of disrupting these programs, or the ability of the Administration to negotiate the climate change treaty or to engage developing countries in a manner consistent with Senate Resolution 98, for instance. And yet, characterizations in the record that activities must be specifically authorized in NOT reflected in the statutory provision that was agreed upon and adopted. It is simply not correct.

There are many programs and activities that are funded by the Congress, and carried out by the Administration, that are not “specifically authorized” by Congress, but are authorized under general provisions. Moreover, the U.S. continues to implement its obligations under the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was ratified by the U.S. with the consent of the Senate. That is why the language that is included in the bills that I have listed—in Agricultural Appropriations, in CJS, VA—HUD, Energy and Water, and now, Foreign Operations—does not say that only activities specifically authorized by law are al-

lowed. If such language were included, it would bring a halt too many bipartisan supported programs and initiatives that this Congress, and many others before it, have supported and funded.

I want to make clear, the language does not preclude the regulatory and non-regulatory programs that have bipartisan support and that save money for businesses and consumers, help the environment, and improve public health. It does not prohibit the many voluntary, non-regulatory programs and initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases—programs that also reduce energy bills, improve the nation's energy security, and reduce local air pollutants.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the United States Government has consistently placed African foreign policy on the back-burner. As a result, economic stagnation, human rights atrocities, and social and political unrest have been perpetuating throughout the continent. Zimbabwe is the perfect opportunity for U.S. intervention to have a positive impact in Africa, and ensure the sustenance of a fair and free democratic process.

President Robert Mugabe has seized 804 farms for immediate distribution and resettlement. Violence has erupted throughout the nation. Not only has he rejected rulings from the independent judiciary, but he has enforced severe restrictions on the opposition's ability to campaign for parliamentary seats. Mugabe is using force to secure support and manipulate the outcome of the legislative elections this June.

The United States must play a proactive role in Zimbabwe to ensure that legitimate elections occur.

South African President, Thabo Mbeki, is securing money from countries like Norway and Saudi Arabia to purchase farms from willing sellers for redistribution. Perhaps, we should also look into a similar policy action that may enable adequate distribution and compensation of land. The European Union, Commonwealth of Nations, Southern African Development Community, and International Republican Institute are all sending observers to evaluate the legitimacy of the election on June 25th. We must do our best to monitor this entire process, and ascertain a comprehensive report on the events that are and will transpire in Zimbabwe.

In addition, I believe that we should still continue to provide money to Zimbabwe for HIV/AIDS programs to strengthen democracy, and to raise living standards despite the corruption that is occurring.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4611, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY 2001. I'd like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for once again including \$13 million in funding for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act expands President Bush's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative—EAI—and provides a creative market-oriented approach to protect the world's most threatened tropical forests on a sustained basis. It is a cost-effective way to respond to the global crisis in tropical forests, and the groups that have the most experience

preserving tropical forests—including the Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and others—agree. The Administration is strongly in support of this effort as well. It is an excellent example of the kind of bipartisan approach we should have on environmental issues.

Tropical forests harbor up to 90% of the Earth's terrestrial biodiversity. They act as “carbon sinks,” absorbing massive quantities of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, thereby reducing greenhouse gases. They regulate rainfall on which agriculture and coastal resources depend, which is of great importance to regional and global climates. And they are the breeding grounds for new drugs that can cure diseases.

Sadly, since 1950, half of the world's tropical forests have been lost. Between 1980 and 1990, 30 million acres of tropical forests—an area larger than the State of Pennsylvania—were lost every year.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act gives the President authority to reduce or cancel U.S. A.I.D. and/or P.L. 480 debt owed by an eligible country to the United States in exchange for the creation of a fund in the local currency that preserves, maintains, and restores tropical forests.

Currently, three countries—Bangladesh, Belize and Peru—have been declared eligible by our government to participate in the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. In March, the President announced that the U.S. and Bangladesh are discussing a Tropical Forest Conservation Act agreement to reduce up to \$6 million of that country's outstanding debt in exchange for its commitment to invest funds in tropical forest conservation programs. This would make Bangladesh the first country to benefit from funding under the Act, and we are hopeful that a final agreement will be reached in the very near future.

Bangladesh's tropical forests cover more than three million acres, including an area that is home to 400 endangered Bengal tigers, the world's largest single population. The area also contains one of the largest mangrove forests in the world, and it has wetlands of internationally-recognized importance. Bangladesh is home to more than 5,000 species of plants, compared to 18,000 in the United States, which is 67 times its size. Clearly, a debt-for-forests arrangement with Bangladesh could play an important role in preserving endangered species and protecting biodiversity, as well as helping that struggling nation's economy.

Seven other nations also have expressed interest in participating in the program. These countries are Ecuador, El Salvador, Thailand, Indonesia, Paraguay, Costa Rica and the Philippines.

I commend Chairman CALLAHAN, Ranking Member PELOSI and the members of the Subcommittee for providing the necessary funds to begin to implement this legislation that preserves and protects important tropical forests worldwide in a fiscally responsible fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. When the reading for amendment reaches section 587, that

section shall be considered read. Before consideration of any other amendment to that section, it shall be in order to consider, and to dispose of, an amendment to strike that section.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal year for such corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available during the current fiscal year may be used to make expenditures, contracts, or commitments for the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology to any country other than a nuclear-weapon state as defined in Article IX of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons eligible to receive economic or military assistance under this Act that has detonated a nuclear explosive after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and tied-aid grants as authorized by section 10 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, \$825,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available until September 30, 2019 for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Act appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, or related programs for tied-aid credits or grants may be used for any other purpose except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph are made available notwithstanding

section 2(b)(2) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945, in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any East European country, any Baltic State or any agency or national thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI:

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(decreased by \$1,000)”.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$179,600,000).”

Page 30, line 9, strike “: *Provided*” and insert the following “, of which \$179,600,000 is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided*, That the \$179,600,000 designated by this paragraph shall be available only to the extent an official budget request that includes designation of this amount as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*”.

Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR DEBT RESTRUCTURING

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For an additional amount for “Debt Restructuring”, \$210,000,000 for a contribution to the “Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund” of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (HIPC Trust Fund): *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress. For payment to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President \$210,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

Ms. PELOSI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 hours and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not even really hear what the gentleman from Alabama said.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I ask for unanimous consent that there be a time limitation on this amendment and all amendments thereto to close in 3 hours.

Ms. PELOSI. On this amendment?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it would yield 1½ hours to the gentlewoman's side, or that the time be equally divided.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure I understood the content of the proposal of the gentleman from Alabama. Is it my understanding that the gentleman is asking unanimous consent that all time reserved for this particular amendment only is 3 hours?

Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. No, it says and all amendments thereto, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. PELOSI. Thereto to this particular amendment, having nothing to do with any other amendments that are related to this subject, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

Ms. PELOSI. That is correct. Okay.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and posing a question to the gentleman from Alabama, I am not clear. Is the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) saying that it will be 3 hours total for everything or just the Pelosi amendment?

Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is just the Pelosi amendment, 3 hours equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and a Member opposed each will control 90 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished chairman of the

full committee for their courtesy as we go forward with this very important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds \$210 million requested by the administration for debt relief for fiscal year 2000 supplemental request and \$179.6 million for fiscal year 2001. The amendment, therefore, fully funds the pending request for debt relief before both fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001. This is approximately a \$390 million amendment.

Approval of this amendment has now become even more compelling in light of the fact that the bill only contains \$82 million of the \$472 million requested for debt relief. We have been working on the debt question in a very positive way with the chairman in his original mark where \$221 million had been provided and where contributions to the HIPC Trust Fund had been authorized.

We now find ourselves with only \$82 million, which is not enough to remove debt relief for Bolivia, which has been imminent and awaiting a sufficient United States contribution. In addition, Honduras, which was devastated by a severe hurricane not long ago, will be unable to consummate their debt relief without additional funds. We have talked already about Mozambique and its readiness for debt relief.

□ 1815

I regret that we have to use the emergency designation for this amendment, but I would point out that the bill already contains \$160 million in emergency designation for the floods in southern Africa as an emergency supplemental funding. In addition, the supplemental just passed contains over \$11 billion in emergency spending for everything from soup to nuts.

It comes down to a matter of priorities. I know that we will be hearing from our colleagues about the urgency, the specifics of the need for this debt relief. This is part of an outside mobilization that is ecumenical in nature, it is worldwide in scope, and it is very, very essential for us to heed.

As I said earlier, we are blessed in this caucus with a very diverse membership. This House of Representatives must hear what our membership is saying. We are blessed with the intellectual resources, the personal experiences, the direct knowledge of the cultures, the economies and the possibilities of countries south of the equator. The world does not stop at the equator, and sometimes I think this body acts as if it does. We must address these important economic needs in Africa and in Latin America and we can do so by the very important way of supporting these funds for debt relief.

I will have more to say on this subject, Mr. Chairman, but I know that many members of the caucus wish to speak to this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) seek to control time in opposition?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) continues to reserve a point of order against the amendment, and the Chair will assume that that point of order will continue to be reserved through the entire length of debate which has been agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we all agree, Mr. Chairman, that the World Bank and the regional development banks have made a lot of bad loans that cannot be repaid. There are many decent and honorable people, including the leaders of our churches, who are asking Congress to support forgiveness of these poor countries' mountain of debt, and I commend them and I want to work with them.

In fact, it is largely fiction that these loans are being repaid right now. That debt burden is one of the main causes of poverty and of HIV/AIDS in many, many poor countries is just not true. It is not the only one. It is a fact that these countries are forced to take out new loans in order to pay back their old loans. There is a vicious cycle of ever-increasing unsustainable debt.

The debt left behind by bad loans is mortgaging the future of these poor countries and it should be forgiven by those who made the bad loans. That is why this committee decided some years ago to make almost all of our own foreign aid in the form of grants and not loans. Worst of all, the challenge of dealing with this cycle of bad debt exhausts the time and energy of the capable men and women who lead some of these countries.

Unbelievably, the British Government is suggesting that HIPC apply to the countries ruled by tyrants and dictators, such as Sudan, Burma, and the Congo. I know that this House does not support helping such leaders. We all agree that continuing this vicious cycle of unsustainable debt makes no sense. That is my mission, and I invite others to join me in halting the accumulation of new debt as fast as old debt is paid off under this Heavily Indebted Poor Country scheme.

Although this bill greatly improves the accountability of the HIPC scheme, almost everyone who has looked into the administration's original proposal finds fault with it. It does not help poor people obtain more health and educational services. Indeed, it could be detrimental towards benefits al-

ready being provided. In most cases, the original HIPC scheme does not even improve cash flow, a myth that has been put into the minds of a lot of good leaders of charitable organizations in our country and throughout the world.

The existing HIPC scheme merely bales out certain multilateral banks and keeps their bond ratings high. This plan is not increasing cash flow to countries; it is going to bail out banks. That is where the money that is being requested is going, to give to banks who have made bad loans.

In this country, if a bank makes a bad loan, there is a mechanism and a tax advantage encouraging it to write off the bad loan. In fact, the FDIC requires that they write off these bad loans. But in the international community, these multilateral banks that have decided that there is a scheme here whereby they can get people's sympathy by talking about the needs of the poor, what they are saying is, pay off these loans to our bank so we can once again be solvent. Thus, we will not have to write off these loans.

This is a message that has not gotten through to the religious leaders that have been convinced. It has not gotten to those members who hear from their pulpits of the church every Sunday that we ought to be more compassionate, I think they ought to take a close look at what really is being proposed and who is going to benefit.

I received a call just a few months ago from some singer named Bono, B-O-N-O, I do not know him, never heard one of his songs, but he was very knowledgeable and very compassionate and very wanting of us to do something for HIPC. I explained to him the GAO report that was requested by many of my colleagues on the Banking Committee which substantiates my argument that this is not going to help poor people get better health and education, that that is a myth, Mr. Chairman. It is not going to help poor people, in many instances, because it simply is bailing out some of these multinational banks. It is not even bailing out our bilateral aid. We have already forgiven those loans. This money is going to these multilateral banks, these development banks, because they have made bad loans.

Now let me tell my colleagues of another myth about this scheme that has been placed upon the American people and the people worldwide who have noble causes, Mr. Chairman. They want to do what is right. They want to help the sick. They want to help needy people. No one denies that if that is what this could accomplish, that is what we would do.

First of all, let me just give a scenario, Mr. Chairman. The scenario is that these countries have borrowed money. They have borrowed money that the banks loaned to them, not

American banks, we are talking about foreign banks have loaned these countries money and now they cannot pay it back. So they are selling this myth, this scheme, to the American people and to people throughout the world.

And, incidentally, I forgot to tell my colleagues that Mr. Bono now agrees with me that the Banks and IMF ought to be more responsible in this endeavor. And we will get to this endeavor in just a few minutes.

But in any event, these countries are not paying interest on this debt from their own resources. They are not paying much principal on this debt, so it is not going to create any substantial cash flow. That is a myth. The principle of the scheme that has led people down this primrose path in expectation of providing human service to poor people is a myth. They are not denied human services because they are paying interest. Poor people are not paying interest, they are not paying debt. To the extent there nations are not paying anything on the principal, there is going to be no cash flow available to these countries to provide services to their people.

It is going to be a cleansing of their books. So the leaders of these poor nations are going to wake up one morning, because of the generosity of the American and European people, if indeed we continue with this program, and their nations are going to be cleansed of debt. They are going to rush to the same banks that have put them in this position today and borrow some more money.

And what are they going to do with it? They are going to do like they did in the country of Uganda, where America and Europe and worked out a debt reduction for the country of Uganda. The next week the president of that country bought a Gulf Stream airplane, a jet, for his own personal use that cost somewhere in the vicinity, with all of the things that go with a jet, of \$50 million. So we got them out of debt one day, we cleansed the slate, and the next day they go right back into debt because a president buys a \$50 million Gulf Stream jet.

At least he had the brilliance to buy it from an American firm, and I am happy about that, but the point I am trying to make is, if we do not put some contingencies to this, then that is what is going to happen in all of these countries and, as a result, no monies are going to be available to help the very people that noble people we are trying to help. There is going to be nothing much available to help them.

So, Mr. Chairman, we will talk later on about this HIPC scheme, but I would like to invite my colleagues to get a copy of the GAO report. The GAO report entitled "Debt Relief Initiative for Poor Countries Faces Challenges," was requested by the Committee on

Banking and Financial Services. Let me tell my colleagues that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, along with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chairman and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, sent to the GAO and they said, listen, give us a report on the debt relief initiative for poor countries who face challenges. And much to their surprise, the report comes back that says much of what I am telling my colleagues; that we ought to take a better and longer look at the process we are going through because we are not going to accomplish any of the goals, or very few at the least, of the goals.

No one in this House, no one in this country will deny the opportunity being given to assist poor people or to assist starving people or to assist sick people or uneducated people. This, in my opinion, is not the right way to go. We have still provided money in this bill to begin the process, but to limit the process by saying that they cannot go right back into debt the next day.

I have discussed this with Secretary Summers, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. And in the beginning they said, oh, no, no, no way. Secretary Rubin told me there is no way we could have any moratorium on additional debt. But when Mr. Summers came on board and he looked at what I was saying, and other people started thinking about the responsibility of this program, now Secretary Summers agrees with me that there possibly should be some restraints on the ability of a nation to go right back in certain kinds debt the day after their debts are forgiven.

Let us not fool ourselves. None of us would do this in our personal businesses, in our family lives, or in any other scenario that exists in the world. Nowhere should we allow these irresponsible and sometimes corrupt leaders the ability to borrow new monies simply because the United States of America and other countries are generous in their concern that people need to be helped.

No one is contesting the need to be helped. I am not saying that we should not. I think we ought to take our limited amount of money and add to the Child Survival Fund, because we know child survival monies go directly to needy people. But under our allocation process we may even be forced to take money away from direct child survival to give it to some bank president who has made a bad decision and free up the books of a nation that is going to go right back into debt the next day and create the same position and posture that we are in today.

□ 1830

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention at this time to yield to my colleagues, but I cannot resist. I must respond to the remarks of the gentleman. With all the respect that I have for him and knowing how important this issue is to so many Members of this Congress and to so many people in the religious community out there, I have to say, very regretfully, that his comments do a disservice to this debate.

This is not a scheme. This is a plan. This is a plan that was very harshly scrutinized and developed by the G-7 in their debt proposal. That proposal is in jeopardy now. Why is it in jeopardy? Because the U.S. has not paid its share of the tab 1 year after the promise.

Who is involved in this plan at the grassroots level? Well, let us start with the Vatican, His Holiness the Pope. Let us reach out then to an ecumenical movement, including Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who has spoken and traveled throughout the world promoting this plan.

Desmond Tutu of South Africa stated: "The new moral crusade follows the Biblical principle of Jubilee. In the Bible it says, all belong to God. All debts are forgiven in the Jubilee year. Debtors make a new beginning."

What this is about, Mr. Chairman, is an attempt on the part of people who minister to the needs of poor people throughout the world to alleviate poverty, promote democratic freedoms, and build markets for our products. In the interest of meeting the needs and lifting people up, there has to be some way to pull away the crushing mantle of this debt.

As our distinguished ranking Member said earlier, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), it is nothing less than we did for countries in Europe, including Poland, following the Soviet collapse, nothing less than that.

When we talk about this, we have to speak about it in a spirit of a strict plan. The IMF is not known for its programs that are soft on countries that want to receive loans. There is a very tough set of standards that these countries must live up to before they can have their debts forgiven, and much of it includes instituting budget austerity and programs that meet the needs of their people.

Our distinguished chairman makes a good point when he asks why should we forgive loans on the one hand and make loans on the other. Well, simply because many of these loans were incurred by previous regimes. The world is changing. We all know that. And these early stages of democracy in these countries require that they be lifted not only from the oppression of the dictatorships but the oppression of

the loans that were taken out by those dictators. So now we want to forgive the loans.

The gentleman is simply not correct when he says these people are not paying any of their debts. The bilateral debts in many cases have a moratorium on repayment by some of these countries. But the debts to the multilateral banks still must be paid. So that is the rub. Many of these countries are paying more for their debt service than they are for education and health in their own countries.

So while we may all agree that loan forgiveness has to be done responsibly, we have no quarrel with that. Of course it must be done responsibly. And those of us who fight for this funding insist on that responsibility. We are not here to talk about irresponsibility.

While we may all agree on that and we would hope that the countries that receive this debt relief all act responsibly as well. An egregious example that the chairman may wish to point out, should not eliminate debt relief for all the other countries.

Many of those countries have put the reforms in place. They are ready for the debt relief. They are ready to go forward with their economic growth that this debt forgiveness will engender for them. But the U.S. are holding it up.

So while I respect the difference of opinion as to whether the amount of money is enough or not, I point out that \$82 million is 20 percent of the President's request. It does not even begin to meet the needs for FY 2000 and 2001.

So if we want to talk about priorities and you say that that money is enough and we say it is not, that is one thing; but to denigrate this proposal which has been negotiated at the highest level, mobilized for, advocated for at the grassroots level throughout the world, and which is urgently needed, is in my view, painfully and sadly a disservice to the debate.

There is a need out there. It is urgent. It is great. We can speak to the specifics of it, and that will happen in this debate. But I would hope that the tenor of our remarks would not be condescending to the leadership of these countries who are trying their best to get on their feet and help their people and that it would not be dismissive of the efforts of the religious communities, starting with His Holiness the Pope and across the board.

I might just name some of the organizations that were with us this morning at a press conference: The Council of Churches, the Catholic Relief Services, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and then many environmental groups, as well, and then Oxfam, Bread for the World, Jubilee 2000, which is the organizing group for this mobilization.

So I hope that the debate will be respectful because it is with respect for

every person on this Earth that we are going forward with this, with the need for people to have their needs met and to have children have some prospect of a future, and that can begin by lifting the burden of this debt.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage my colleagues during this 3 hours of debate on this issue, and I think we should debate it and that is why I have not insisted on my point of order at this time but I still reserve that point, to take a look at what the GAO reported in response to the very question that is being raised tonight. The very people who asked for the GAO report thought it would be positive, it came back negative; and now they are saying ignore the report, ignore the responsibility we have to the taxpayers of this country, do it irresponsibly.

In this bill we provide \$69 million to start the process, but we restrict some of that assistance to the extent that they must not borrow new money for a certain period of time, 9 months in some instances, 30 months in other instances.

So we are not putting a veto on the HIPC program. We are providing \$69 million for the program, and in the process we will be able to work out a reasonable process where we can achieve the same goal that these people want.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) mentioned that the Pope has come out in favor of this. Well, I would like to tell the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that the Pope is also against abortion. Does she agree with the Pope on abortion? If so, then we will not have the population debates that no doubt will take place later on in the bill.

I know what the Pope has said. I think all ministers throughout the world agree with the destination that all of us are trying to seek. We all want to get to the same point. But this is not a responsible mechanism at this time because it permits them to go right back into debt and to squander money and to put their country in the same financial condition that they are in today.

The GAO investigators confirmed that the only way there would be significant new resources for health and education in poor countries would be if these countries borrowed the money through new loans from the multilateral banks.

I mean, how more clear could it be with the GAO report that the very proponents of this issue are advocating, how clear could it be?

So what we have done in this bill is to say that we are not going to cut direct child survival assistance, direct

assistance to HIV/AIDS in Africa, we are not going to cut from our allocation. Instead, we are going to give \$69 million this year; and during the next 6 or 7 months, we can come up with a more responsible plan that denies these countries the opportunity to go right back into debt as they did in the country that I mentioned a few minutes ago and buy \$50 million jets so they can travel throughout the world, or to even push some of this money into Swiss banks.

So I am saying let us do it, but let us do it responsibly; and let us make absolutely certain that what we do goes to the intended people that we want to help. I do not know how more reasonable someone could be.

The money is provided, the \$69 million, to pay our fair share for the next 6 or 7 months. And when they come up with a responsible plan that will achieve intended purpose of this process, then we will give them some additional money. But to bail out some of these multilateral banks should not be our mission, and that is exactly what we are doing under the proposal that is before us.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and an expert on international debt relief.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I am again grateful to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the leadership that she is providing on the whole issue of Africa but particularly on this whole business of debt relief.

I am sorry that the chairman of the committee is leaving the room. I wish that he would stay, given some of the comments that he has made.

First of all, let me take up the issue that the chairman seems to be alluding to: these irresponsible people in Africa, they do not know how to handle their money; we give them money and they go out and they buy jets.

Well, I think we should reject that kind of condescending description of the problems of Africa. We do not hear him talking about Poland. We do not hear him raising questions about who else flies jets. We do not hear anything about Africa. We know what that is all about. We are accustomed to that kind of condescending accusations coming to people of color. I do not like it. I wish it would stop. And I do not appreciate the fact that this is all that can be talked about when we talk about what we do or what we do not do for Africa.

The fact of the matter is this country met in the big G-8 summit and gave leadership to the idea that we should

do something about forgiving debt. All of the churches, organized religions of the world, came together to talk about Jubilee 2000 and put together a magnificent program that included the churches and organized religion and included all the nongovernmental organizations and they moved forward. And this country made a commitment and we led. And we have worked very hard for debt relief; we have worked very hard for debt forgiveness. And we should forgive the debts of the most vulnerable and the poorest countries of the world.

First of all, they cannot afford to pay it back. Some of them are starving their children, not being able to pay for education and health needs trying to pay back this debt. And the interest keeps piling up and piling up on this debt. They will never get it paid, even those countries that have gone under structural adjustment and have done well. We have allowed them to take from their economy dollars that they should be using for health and education and comply with structural adjustment, and we still have not gone back to help them in any appreciable way.

But we find that the chairman does not talk about the increases that they did, foreign military financing program, \$60 million per year for the next 10 years. If they are so concerned about how they spend the money and doing it in a responsible way and making sure that they set priorities, how do they have money to increase the foreign military financing program by \$60 million a year and try to do it for 10 years?

□ 1845

I think this is outrageous. I think we need to deal with it like it is. This is Africa. Somehow it is less deserving. Somehow the people of Africa and poor people of the world in Central and South America and in other places are not worthy of debt relief or support. They are worthy only of condescending remarks that they cannot handle their money, that they only use their money to buy things they do not need.

We did not talk like that when we talked about what we were going to do when the Soviet Union broke up. We do not talk about Russia that way. We do not talk about Poland that way. And we darn sure do not talk about Israel that way. There is nothing worse than a bully. There is nothing worse than somebody who picks on the least of these and the most vulnerable of these.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we began this debate by saying that this was a bad bill, but now the bad bill has become not only a terrible bill but terrible disposition ex-

pressed by the majority about Africa and its ability to handle the resources associated with providing for what the President of the United States has indicated a threat to the national security of the United States.

What this bill fundamentally says in light of the gentleman's disposition is that lives in the Middle East somehow are just a little bit different or a little bit more precious than lives in Africa. There are 5,000 Africans who are dying every day associated with the AIDS disease and the AIDS crisis. The export earning potential that we passed, the by-product of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, the debt service is designed to save health care and reprioritize issues like education and health care on sub-Saharan Africa's continent. That is what is so critical indeed in this bill.

A number of my colleagues have come to the floor of the Congress today and said, yes, AIDS is a problem; yes, all of these other problems exist in the world, but what we have to recognize is that a significant portion of this bill confronts very critical negotiations that are occurring at Camp David. Well, I sure hope someone at Camp David is talking about AIDS in Africa because Time magazine, Newsweek magazine, The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Times, everyone has said that the number one plague confronting the world is AIDS on the continent of Africa and for this Congress to play a blind eye and to ignore that fact is a disgrace. We ought to do something about it in this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To briefly respond to the remarks by the gentleman from California and gentleman from Illinois, I respect their passion and their concern for the people of Africa. But not once during my statement did I mention the continent of Africa. I did by chance mention Uganda because of the ridiculous situation that took place when the president bought the jet. I might remind the gentleman that even the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, has now decided that I am right and they have cut off further debt forgiveness to Uganda until such time as they can get this situation straightened out.

My remarks were meant to be to the world. It applies to Central America. It applies to South America. It applies to Africa. It applies to every country where we are proposing to provide debt forgiveness. So I meant no disrespect to any race or disrespect to any continent. I am not condescending. I am telling you the facts. The facts are that we are giving \$69 million of taxpayers' money towards this program to begin the process whereby in the process, and this is less than the Senate incidentally, that in this process they can

come forward with a more responsible plan that can protect the integrity of the financial situation of these particular countries. The fact that some of these countries are in Africa, I did not mention that. You brought that up. I sort of resent you saying that I am condescending and implying that this is racist because it is not. This is responsible legislation.

I am proposing that we do what you want to do, that is, provide for the needy people, whether they be in Latin America, South America, Africa, Israel, Russia, wherever they are, that we do it; but we do it responsibly. I do not think that is being condescending. I think it is being responsible, because we have the same exact destination in mind. We want to help needy people. We want to help the sick. We want to eliminate HIV/AIDS. We want to do all of this. We want these countries to be financially stable. But to just give them a blank check and say, well, this debt is forgiven, and, incidentally, this money is not going to these countries. This money is to go to these banks. It is not going to the countries. It goes to the banks, so the banks' books can be cleared. So we have no difference as to our destination or goal or aims or wants. We have identical destinations.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I will yield to the gentleman from California if she will stop saying that I am condescending.

Ms. WATERS. No, I will not stop saying it yet, but I do appreciate your yielding. I would like to ask a question if I may.

Is there \$90 million in fiscal year 2001 for the foreign military financing program with \$60 million of that an increase going to Israel and \$60 million over the next 10 years in an increase while you are being prudent in your budgeting?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct. But that was the request of the President of the United States. I would like to remind the gentleman with respect to the assistance to Israel whereby we did increase the foreign military financing by \$60 million, we cut \$120 million from the economic support. I would like to remind the gentleman that that was the third rail of politics before I became chairman. No one dared walk on this floor and say, "Let's cut assistance to Israel." But I went to Israel and at 2 o'clock in the morning met with then Prime Minister Netanyahu and he admitted that the economy there was now such because of the benevolence and the assistance of the United States, the economy was such that they could begin responsible reduction of economic support to Israel, and that process has been now for the last 4 years, and I have cut their economic assistance by nearly \$120 million a year, so nearly \$500 million.

And so the argument that the financial assistance for military financing is moot, because the bottom line is I have cut Israel \$60 million a year net for the last 4 years because the Israeli government agreed to that. So I do not think it is irresponsible nor a good comparison.

Ms. WATERS. Sir, you made cuts in all of Africa's budget. Where did you then increase Africa's budget where the cuts have been made in both the development fund and the other fund for Africa? You cut them, but there is no place where you increased the funds to Africa. Where did you do likewise for Africa?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I have proposed \$69.4 million in HIPC funds which is an increase. That is an increase in itself.

Ms. WATERS. Sir, the President asked for \$400 million.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I do not care what the President asked for.

Ms. WATERS. You told me what the President asked for in military financial assistance.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Just because the President of the United States—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend.

The Chair would kindly request that all Members follow regular procedure in yielding to one another or in requesting time from those who are controlling the time. The gentleman from Alabama controls the time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the true scenario is this. The President of the United States has committed to participate in this debt forgiveness program of worldwide contributions, and we intend to fulfill responsibly some of the requests of the President. But just because the President calls up or writes me a note and sends a note over here and says, Sonny, give me 4 or \$500 million does not make it an obligation of the United States of America. I think that you as a Congressperson and that I as a Congressperson have a responsibility to ask the President, Are you sure this is the right way to go? That is what I am doing. I think the President is making a big mistake, not in the amount of money that he requested, not for the programs that he is requesting that be enhanced, but because of the mechanism to get to the end result of the entire proposal of HIPC is where the mistake is.

So I am saying, wait a minute. And you all know I am not the smartest man in the world. I am not the dumbest man in the world, either. And I have some background and experience in finance, not multibillions of dollars like some of our colleagues here in the House, but I have some experience. And anywhere in life, even in your family, if I overspent my Visa card, for example, and I went to my kids and I say, Kids, help me out, your daddy has done an irresponsible thing, the credit card company is telling me, "Well, if they

don't do this, they're going to take away my house and they're going to sue me," do you think even my kid would say, "Dad, I'm going to help you, we're going to pay off your debt, but you're going to tear up that credit card."

That is exactly what I am saying. I am saying we should not give these countries the ability to go right back into debt the next day. I am telling you that this is a mistake, but at the same time I am admitting that maybe I am wrong. For in the interim, here is \$70 million towards our contribution, and we can go ahead and start with these programs. Just as we have already forgiven most of our bilateral debt, now we can help to bail out some of these banks because maybe I am wrong. So I am providing \$69.4 million in this bill as a down payment to keep the program going in the hopes that the GAO report is wrong. Maybe I am wrong. But the GAO backs up what I am saying, and I think I am right at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very, very dismayed by the comments that have been made by my distinguished chairman in this regard, because we can have a legitimate difference of opinion on an issue, but the course that this debate is taking is not worthy of this institution. We have a very serious policy decision to make. We have Members of this House who have worked very hard on this issue, and who know a great deal about the loan forgiveness program.

The gentleman is correct. We do not want to promote irresponsibility. That has never been an issue. The fact, though, is that if you are lifting oppressive debt, much of it incurred by previous regimes, why should a country not be able to borrow from the poorest of the poor window of the World Bank that administers to the poorest of the poor, the IDA window, assistance for basic human needs? For basic human needs? Why should they not be able to start investing in their economies?

It is very simplistic to say, oh, I tore up my credit card, or my son tore up my credit card. That is not an analogy that is even in any way close to this. This is about countries wanting to assume responsibility. This is about countries saying yes to the reforms that they must comply with when they are applying for loan forgiveness. This is a very strict standard that is applied to qualify for these loans as HIPC, highly indebted poor countries.

So if we want to say that this is not an important enough priority to our country, then let us say that, but do not mischaracterize what is being proposed here and what is being supported across the board by religious commu-

nities throughout the world and which the administration supports. The Secretary of the Treasury does not support the chairman's position. Of course we all support responsibility; and that is what we are advocating, too.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can have the tenor of the remarks return to a place that is more respectful of the hard work that has gone into this. I say that with great respect for the chairman and with great sadness, quite frankly.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, one of the guiding principles of United States foreign policy is that whenever possible we use our assistance to enable developing countries to stand on their own two feet. That is precisely what this amendment would do and why I support it.

Many countries in the developing world have been unable to spend the necessary resources on health care and on education for their citizens because they have been saddled by debilitating debt. New regimes elected with high hopes for economic opportunity and democratic ideals will remain unable to achieve their noble objectives because of debt incurred by previous, often corrupt regimes.

Debt relief, as some contend, is not about giving a free ride to developing nations. That is not what we are talking about. It is about helping countries in sub-Saharan Africa build the health care infrastructure necessary to fight the AIDS epidemic.

□ 1900

It is about giving countries the chance to educate children, giving them hope for a better future. It is about giving nascent democratic regimes the chance to build constituencies, perpetuating the ideals of democracy abroad.

The cost of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is a small price to pay for the myriad of benefits it will bring. It is disgraceful, in my judgment, that this small amount of money that this bill provides for debt relief will stall the global HIPC initiative and may deny relief to some of the world's most committed economic reformers. These countries have worked hard at developing concrete poverty-reduction targets, sound economic management practices. It would be shameful for us to turn our back on this important initiative.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Members if they have the opportunity

to get a copy, I keep talking about this GAO report which was requested by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and others to substantiate their claim of the merits of this program; and once again, I do not deny that the intentions of those interested in this are anything other than noble, and I share the exact same goals with them.

But in the results in brief of the GAO report, where they requested that the GAO report look into what we were doing, the results in brief say that the GAO's analysis shows that the decline in debt service for the seven countries, they selected seven countries in order to do their study, that these countries will only free up resources for additional poverty reduction if in the years prior to their qualifying for debt relief they are allowed to continue to borrow at the same level.

That is precisely what I am saying is the fallacy of this overall proposal. They go on to say that this occurs because the countries previously borrowed for several reasons, including debt payments; and they will need to continue borrowing after receiving debt relief in order to meet their remaining debt payments and to increase spending for poverty reduction.

These countries, are not paying any interest, they are borrowing more money to pay the interest. They are incurring more principal in order to pay the annual interest; and what they are doing is continuing to build up this debt.

So what this report is saying is that the only way they are going to free up cash is if indeed they have more borrowed money which they cannot pay back.

The route that we ought to be taking as an international community, and I am Catholic and I disagree with the Pope, because I don't think the Pope has had the opportunity to read such reports as this GAO report, nor do I think the Pope has had the opportunity to reflect on this. He is a very busy person. I do not think he has had the opportunity to reflect on the total program as to whether or not this mission will really benefit the very people he wants to help.

If the Pope wants to help, if the gentlewoman from California wants to help, if this Congress wants to help, I have no opposition to that. But if we are going to do it, let us do it right.

I started telling you about this credit card that I have overextended, so I go to my children and I say, Listen, Daddy is in trouble. Will you pay off my credit card? I promise you I won't do it again. My kids would say, Daddy, we are going to cut your credit card up.

That is the responsible thing to do, and that is what we ought to be telling leaders of these nations, whether they be in Central America, South America, Africa, Russia, wherever they are, that we are going to pay off your debts. You

are not going to get any of the money because you have got to flow it straight through to a multinational bank. But we are going to allow you to flow this money through to a multinational bank to bail them out of their financial crisis, but you are not going to be able to go to that same bank tomorrow and borrow more money.

Now, maybe I am wrong, but that is the way I feel, and you are entitled to feel the way you feel. I think I am right, and it is not uncommon for these two sides to differ on a direction we might take on any given issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I must say, I differ with the gentleman in his interpretation of the GAO report; but if he is right, I am not that much of a theologian, but I notice that he corrected the Pope with the GAO. Are we hearing today the doctrine of GAO infallibility being promulgated on the floor of the House?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, conceivably so, and I am not questioning the intelligence of the Pope. I am just telling you the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) tells me we should support this because the Pope supports it, and my response to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is the Pope does not support abortion, and that if she is going to pay attention to everything the Pope says, she ought to be on my side on the abortion issue. That was just the point I was making.

But the Pope, as I say, is a very busy person. But I think if I had the opportunity and the privilege of appearing before the Pope for 15 minutes, as I have had the opportunity to appear before other people and convince them, that I could convince the Pope that I am right. The Pope would be issuing a proclamation tomorrow that would be read at the pulpit of every Catholic church in the world saying, Wait a minute. One of our colleagues, Catholic colleagues, has discovered a flaw in this proposal, and we ought to correct it and go forward.

That is what I do with the \$69 million that I have included in this bill. Let us go forward, but let us do it cautiously.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield, since he referenced my name in his remarks?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman says that I heed the Pope when he is talking about debt relief, but not when he is talking about a woman's right to choose, or words to that effect, my comments to the gentleman were he was mocking this as a scheme; and I said this is not a scheme, this is a plan that has been thought out

and proposed by the G-7. Just to get to the Pope for a moment—

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time and tell the gentlewoman an explanation of the word "scheme." The scheme is not intended to reflect on the mission. I am saying a scheme has been presented to great charitable people of this world that does not do what they have represented to them in their proposal. Therefore, I think it is a scheme that has been concocted to convince people in this country, charitable people with good intentions, I think they have been misled; and, if that is the case, I think that should be called a scheme.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentleman will further yield, the chairman knows I have the highest regard for him, and it is with a heavy heart, as Lyndon Johnson used to say, that I say to the gentleman that he is absolutely wrong.

I want to just get back to the Pope for a moment. The gentleman's powers of persuasion are considerable, but I doubt that he could persuade the Pope, the head of the church, whose mission is to alleviate poverty and respect the dignity and worth of every person on the face of this Earth, that we should not have international debt relief because of some egregious example that the gentleman might think up.

The GAO, if one reads the report, admits, we have never said that if you forgive the debt, that there will not be future lending. The debt is from a previous regime, or mistakes made before; and now we are talking about a fresh start.

But to get back to the Pope for a moment, because I want to make this point, I have never mocked, never, ever mocked, in fact I have respected the views of people who have a different view, some of them are in my own family, about a woman's right to choose and the rest. So really it offends me, and I say that regretfully, that the gentleman would say well, if you do not listen to the Pope about choice, why do you listen to the Pope about this?

Well, I respect the Pope's view on all of these things. But when the gentleman was characterizing this as a scheme, and now the gentleman is defining a scheme differently than he emphasized it earlier, it was with disdain; and that is the part that I find regrettable, because this is a very important debate.

This is a debate about whether our country will live up to its responsibilities that our President committed to at the G-7 one year ago. He is going to leave for Japan, for Okinawa, in another week, following the Camp David meetings; and he is going to have to go there and say I cannot fulfill the responsibility, the obligations that we incurred last year, because, maybe because somebody bought an airplane

someplace, I do not know; but any excuse will do if you do not want to do something.

So to say that \$69 million is a start, and we all want to get to the same place, is like saying let us all go to the Moon; here are your roller skates. That means I cannot get there.

So let us help these people get there. If we all do share the goal of alleviating poverty, if we all do share the goal of eradicating AIDS, as the gentleman referenced in his remarks, we have to put the resources where our compassion is. Compassion is great, but it is no substitute for a positive plan to go forward and the resources to match that proposal.

So we have an important decision to make here, respectful of each other's positions, and it is: Is it that a statement of the values of this country is that we will help these countries get on their feet? Standards have been set by the IMF. If it is a given that once the oppressive old debt is removed that countries not be able to incur further debt, I cannot even understand how you could put a moratorium on basic human needs, loans from the IDA window, the poorest of the poor window of the World Bank, and say that that is okay, we will teach them some discipline and they will not be able to incur any debts. Economic development is essential to the success of these countries, and they need the hard window loans as well.

So we are not talking about carelessness or irresponsibility; we are talking about sensible planning.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman has ample time. I thought she was going to question something I had said.

Let me just tell the gentlewoman, number one, we are not talking about debt that our country has given to these foreign countries. We have already forgiven that debt. We have fulfilled our shared responsibility of that HIPC agreement through our bilateral debt forgiveness. I am not talking about debt that these countries owe to the United States of America. I am talking about debts that they owe to the multilateral banks.

I am saying at the same time, SONNY, maybe you are wrong. That was my fear, that I would be making a mistake; and just in case I am wrong, which I really do not think at this time I am, nor have I heard any argument to the contrary. Just in case I am wrong, Mr. President, here is a down payment; here is \$69 million to get you into the spring or fall, whereby we can look at a potentially more responsible mechanism for achieving the same goals that we all want to achieve.

I do not see anything unreasonable about that, but I know that you all do; and I know that you all have the right to disagree, and I respectfully disagree with you.

I will disagree with the Pope if indeed he says this is an irresponsible thing, but the Pope is too intelligent a person to deny that I am not right on this issue, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

I would like to talk about what the history of debt relief has been. When I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and the Iron Curtain fell, all of a sudden we had a tremendous opportunity. All kinds of countries in Eastern Europe, where people looked like us, they had the same colored skin, they had lots of people in this country lobbying for their cause because they were the same nationality my wife happens to be Polish, for instance, and we recognized that the previous Communist government had stayed in power only by incurring huge amounts of debts that were totally irresponsible. When they left power we had a choice of whether or not we were going to create the economic conditions that would allow a democratic government to flourish or not. So we forgave debt.

As a result, you were able to get new investments, new economic growth in countries like Poland, and today they are reasonably healthy democracies, given what their history has been the last 50 years.

□ 1915

We also had debt relief provided for Egypt. That was done unilaterally with no consultation whatsoever with the United States Congress by one of the previous Republican administrations. And that was done because we needed the support of Egypt in the Middle East power game, and so not many questions were asked. But now we get to the hard cases. Now we get to the regions of the world that do not look like so many of us. We get to Africa, we get to Latin America, and the political pressures for us to do what is right and just are not quite as heavy as the political pressures were when we were dealing with countries that looked just like most of us.

So now we are told that because some idiot from one of those countries made a dumb purchase, that somehow, that example ought to be used as an excuse to avoid our responsibilities in dealing with this problem in Latin America and Africa.

Now, the problem is very simple. A lot of these countries ran up debt when they were working for us and for the CIA and for our intelligence operations; they were conduits through which we were able to learn a lot about

our political enemies around the world. So the Congress was asked to close its eyes while those governments did lots of dumb things. They abused human rights; they ran up huge debts. Now, we have new governments, and we are being asked to provide the same opportunity for new investment and new economic growth in those countries that we provided in countries that look just like most of us. It has been harder here. We are told that, well, this is just international debt that we are forgiving here and so we ought to put more stringent conditions on it.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there are some countries that ought not to be lent an additional dime, and there are other countries who will be in a state of social and economic collapse if they do not receive new lending. We have some countries that are spending so much paying off the debts incurred by their former governments, that they do not have any money left to spend on education and health for their own children.

So we are here, not out of any bleeding heart knee-jerk reaction. We are here because we have two responsibilities. One is to our own national security, because we cannot exist forever, no matter how strong we are, in a world where there are large segments that are essentially poverty-ridden and open to all kinds of potential political mischief; and secondly, we are asked to respond to our moral responsibilities to help people who never had a say in incurring these debts in the first place. The ironic thing about it is that they are not collectible. They are lousy debts and all we are doing is clear the books so that we will give these new governments the same opportunity to start afresh that we gave other governments who look like most of us.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we ought to get on with the job, we will sooner or later; and if this bill did what it ought to do, we would be able to vote for it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this committee; I do not know all of the great international nuances that are being discussed here. But I did come to the floor to speak, because it seems like the debate has gotten to a point to where there may be fingers pointed and charges being made back and forth, but I would just like to remind my colleagues that this debate about what other countries and their citizens may want or need, what the Pope may want or need, we do not sit here as a governing body to represent their opinions. We are here to represent the people of the United States. This is the people's House of the United States.

I am a practicing Catholic, although I happen to be a pro-choice Catholic,

but the Pope does not direct me how I am going to stand on a policy statement of how the people of the United States' money should be spent. It is not a foreign government's money, and it is not the Pope's money. It is the American people's money, and it is not our money.

I just want us to understand that when we talk about forgiveness of debt, we should think about how many Americans are out there right now who say, this sounds pretty good. I would sure love to see Congress cut me the same deal that they are talking about cutting other people all over the world. Mr. Chairman, American taxpayers may be watching tonight saying, it really is true.

I am just saying I hope that we understand as we are talking about all of these bigger issues that there are people out there that are struggling to pay their taxes, struggling to be able to play by the rules, struggling to pay for their debts, and then seeing the House of Representatives, the people's House talking and saying, we need to talk about forgiveness of certain debts, talking about it as if it is our personal funds that we are willing to have a charitable contribution out of.

I bet, my colleagues, there are a lot of Americans out there who would say, great, Members of Congress, take it out of your pocket and put it in there, but you are taking it out of our pockets as taxpayers and giving it to another country, and giving it and giving it. It is a small, small, minute percentage of what we allocate out of this House, but do we not realize how much it just really rubs the taxpayers wrong when they hear the discussion of even the term forgiveness. I think that maybe we ought to talk about would we not be more productive in making people independent.

I just want to go back to this whole discussion of the Pope. He does not pay the taxes and we do not represent him. I follow him as a religious leader of my church, but the Constitution mandates to me and every Member of this body that we represent the people in our district, not even one of the great religious leaders that lives in Rome.

I would just say, we may disagree on this issue, on the technicalities of this issue, but I think the dialogue has gotten to where it is either/or: I am going to impugn your opinion for my opinion. I just think that people that are watching today and Members of Congress are watching, and remember, we are forcing this money, let me remind my colleagues, we are forcing this money from American citizens and resident aliens, forcing them under the threat of imprisonment to give us money, and we are sending this money all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obligation to make sure that every cent is responsible and is being responsible in its ap-

plication and is being held accountable. I think the chairman has pointed out that that cannot be said with all of these funds, and we have the obligation to make it so.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BILBRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman explain to me how we help taxpayers when we refuse to write off debts that are uncollectible that will never be repaid and which simply get in the way of creating markets for products that are made by Americans so that they can have better jobs and earn more money?

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say the same argument would be made by many taxpayers, Mr. Ranking Member; but the fact is that they are overburdened again and again and feel like they are over-taxed. The concept of saying they have to choose between child care and helping their family or sending their kids to school or being able to give what they want to their children, or the fact that they need, by force of law, to contribute to the Federal Government money that we then send overseas. I think that this is an issue that we just have to understand the dialog about.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and also for her outstanding leadership on this issue.

Let me begin by saying that I am very proud that Americans and specifically American taxpayers are not selfish, that they cannot bear the spectacle of 22 million people infected with AIDS in Africa; they cannot turn their backs on those people, and that they are not selfishly thinking only of their own concerns.

With respect to this amendment, I am here to support it. Here are the facts: the President asked for \$475 million, this committee only gave \$82 million, and that is a travesty.

Now, we hear a lot about corruption, but I am sure the chairman is not trying to say that the people who are dying in Africa ought to be sacrificed because of a corrupt leader. What we need to know about the facts of this issue is this: in Tanzania, for example, the government spends four times as much money on debt payments as it spends on health and education combined. What we need to know in this debate is that Uganda, Zambia, Nicaragua, and Honduras spends more on debt service than they spend on health and education combined. So this debate is not about corruption and it is not about wasteful spending.

Now, here is an issue that really strikes me as interesting. The gentleman talks about how we need to be concerned about how the money is spent; we need to have conditions. We can apply conditions. The problem is, the committee did not just apply conditions, the committee cut the money substantially. It cut 80 percent of the funds that were going to be used for debt forgiveness.

This is a project in which the United States and other developed countries are stepping forward and saying, there is a major epidemic, pandemic in Africa, sub-Saharan Africa, as well as in other countries, and we want to forgive debt as a group, this is true burden-sharing, to enable these countries to move forward, to spend money on health and education rather than on bad debts. This is a case where we really need to lead.

Thankfully, the American people are not selfish. I think they will agree with us that we ought to adopt the gentlewoman's amendment; we ought to put the money into debt forgiveness; we ought to give these countries a chance, and we ought to respond to the crisis that exists in Africa.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for allowing the time for me to participate in the debate.

I do not want us to lose sight on the importance of our country and who we are in the world. This is the greatest country in the world in many respects. We are enjoying a surplus in a time when many in our country are living better than they have ever lived. At the same time, many do not live as well.

This foreign operations budget, as has been said over and over today, is less than 1 percent of our total budget. When we talk about debt forgiveness, we do it all the time, with our own American citizens, and we should. The S&L bailout, as we remember. We forgave a lot of those debts and many of those people involved in that scandal are living very well today. I am not opposed to it; I want us to take our responsibility as citizens seriously, to look at the world and see the ones who need forgiveness at this time.

The G-8 countries of which we are the leaders to look to America to see what we do for the least of these in that G-8 environment. We have a responsibility and an opportunity to give and forgive debt for some of the poorest countries, who have no idea and cannot pay that debt, were not responsible for it. This country gave that debt to many of those leaders who are long gone. Why, then, do we today hold those same children in those very poor

countries responsible? We do have standards. The IMF has standards. Bolivia, Mozambique have met those standards. But the appropriation is now not there to help those countries and other poor countries come into the 21st century.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House of Representatives, debt forgiveness in this year of jubilee, taught and mentioned in the Bible, is upon us. Let us rise to the occasion, do what is right, and forgive those poor countries at a time when God has blessed us to forgive.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I must confess, I am deeply distressed by the tone of this debate, at least in parts of it.

Let me just cite one fact. For the 41 Nations that have been identified as the most heavily-indebted poor countries, external long-term debt rose rapidly from less than \$7 billion in 1970 to \$169 billion today.

There has been some reference that the amendment would pay off multinational banks, as if these are multinational corporations, kind of using that rhetorical device. We are talking about debt owed to multilateral institutions and governments, not in this instance to private for-profit institutions.

It has also been said that cash flow is not affected. That is just patently wrong. Unless debt is eliminated, these countries cannot obtain further cash flow. With elimination of debt, they will.

Mr. Chairman, this is no scheme. This is a proposal, an edifice built by sovereign nations, by the G-8, who have decided that it is in their self-interest to act on this debt.

Then it is said, well, let us give the money to the child survival fund, instead. As a former assistant administrator of the Foreign Aid Agency, I am all for monies for child survival, but let no one think that that is an alternative to governments pulling their own weight. Indeed, the Republican administrations have insisted that aid has to be shifted to help countries pull their own weight.

I want to read the last part of the GAO report. I hope the gentlewoman from California will give me another minute if I need it, but I do not think I need it quite yet. I want to straighten out the references to the GAO report.

I just saw it now. But we do not have to read it from cover to cover to know that the statements here using the GAO report are a distortion, purely and simply. Here is the key paragraph, and I have dealt with a lot of GAO reports, including when I was in a previous administration:

The uncertainties over whether the initiative provides a lasting exit from debt problems, the tension between quick debt relief and preparing poverty reduction strategies and the difficulties in financing the initiative should not be seen, however, as a reason to abandon efforts to provide debt relief to eligible countries.

Heavily-indebted poor countries continue to carry unsustainable debt burdens that are unlikely to be lessened without debt relief. But participants and observers may need to have a more realistic expectation of what the initiative may ultimately achieve.

To use this report as an argument to thwart the effort of the administration to live up to its essential commitments as part of a G8 program I think is inexcusable.

I want to close with this. What is in our national interest? Africa and other countries face a tragedy, a human tragedy that could affect all of us, including our security and surely our sense of morality. For us to sit here and insufficiently fund debt relief is inexcusable in terms of American national security and American ethics. We must do better. Adopt this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), former chair of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and an expert on international debt forgiveness.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me and for doing such a great job.

The gentleman from Michigan made it very clear that when the chairman of the subcommittee quoted the GAO report, he got it exactly backwards. I guess to just stick with the theological tone that has occasionally intruded here, we now know that the devil may quote Scripture and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs may quote the GAO report, but neither one of them can be trusted on the interpretation.

The GAO says that debt relief is not enough. It does not say, do not give them debt relief, it says debt relief is not enough to do poverty reduction. So the notion that because debt relief is not enough to accomplish the ideal, we should therefore do less, makes sense only to the chairman of the subcommittee.

I also want to talk about the Pope. Obviously, we all have agreements and disagreements with the Pope, although respect for him, as the gentlewoman from California said.

But the Pope is not speaking here ex cathedra. This is not primarily a theological exposition. The Pope heads the most extensive anti-poverty organiza-

tion in the world. Priests and nuns and church workers are the most sustained group of anti-poverty workers all over the world. The Pope's recommendations in this public policy come to us better grounded, I must say, than the off-the-cuff observations of the chairman of the subcommittee. The Pope is reporting based on information he gets from people who are the on-the-ground poverty workers.

Here is the issue. This analogy to a credit card is, as the gentleman from California said, to use a technical parliamentary term, silly. We are talking not about an individual with a credit card, we are talking about, in many cases, regimes that borrowed and in many cases were overthrown with our help because they were corrupt and brutal.

New governments are in power. The question is whether the people who are now living in those countries should be bled, should be denied basic food and medicine, to pay off old debts.

The gentleman has said, Well, it is to bail out the multinational banks. No, the multinational banks, and let us make this point, when the bill came to us last year from the administration it did have provisions so some of the funds could have, after debt relief, continued to fund some of the activities of the multinational financial institutions. We stopped that. The bill that passed says the funds generated, whether from gold sales or from appropriations, go only for debt relief and nothing else.

Now, to say to these countries, by the way, we will give you debt relief but you cannot then ever borrow for anything else, is a very cruel approach. What about a country that has instituted democracy, that has instituted some reforms and gets the debt relief, and then wants to deal in a responsible way with its economic development? No entity finances all economic developments on a cash basis. People do not buy homes that way, businesses do not grow that way, and countries require some investments.

Investment means, give us some money now and we will pay you back later, maybe through equity, maybe through debt.

I have to say, and I am glad the gentleman from Alabama is back here now, because I want to express my disagreement with one of his constant premises, he keeps telling us that we agree on the goal. I must tell the gentleman that I see no evidence of that. I see no evidence that the gentleman from Alabama has been strongly moved to try to alleviate poverty.

Indeed, we heard the gentleman from California previously say the taxpayers do not want us using their money this way. I am very proud to be able to say that I believe that the people I represent, the people in my congressional district, on the whole want me to vote

to use this relatively small amount of money to stop children from starving to death and to prevent disease from ravaging innocent people. I really believe that. If they do not, they can find another representative.

I do not believe that the people I represent do not want me to do that. The gentleman from Alabama said before, well, he set up this children's survival fund. The problem there is that money is not leaking but rushing out of these countries, on the one hand.

It does not do much to put money in on one end if it just goes out in the other. We need both. They are not alternatives.

The gentleman said the problem is the allocation. But the gentleman voted for the budget that set up the allocation. The allocation is an artificial fact which everybody knows is not going to hold up anyway.

The fact is this: Virtually every organization in the world, religious and nonreligious, Catholic, Protestant, secular, has come together to lobby the American government for this. This is not some construct of the Clinton administration or the Blair administration or the Jospin administration, this is a response by governments to the overwhelming demand of nongovernmental organizations, religious and nonreligious, based on their experience.

They say, look, the very least you can do is to go to the poorest countries in the world and do not make them continue to pay out the money. There is no blank check here. There is a requirement that the countries follow some basic responsible positions.

They will not do it perfectly. If the rule was that money does not go to anybody who did not spend it perfectly, we would have no CIA, we would have no HUD, we would have no Pentagon.

But here is the issue. Overwhelmingly, not just the Pope but the people the Pope supervises and all the Protestant churches and all of the non-governmental organizations and environmental organizations and poverty organizations that deal with international human concerns came to the governments and said, do this, and our government has been willing to do this.

There is an obstruction. The obstruction is the budget that has been brought forward which does not fund it in anything like the adequate amounts. The GAO report in fact, read correctly and fairly and in context, says do this, but this in and of itself is not enough.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment, and I have had more than ample opportunity to sit in committee meetings and share time with my good friend, the gentleman

from Massachusetts, who is extremely far-reaching in his thoughts and what have you.

However, I must rise to respectfully disagree with some of his conclusions.

I just want to share some of the deliberations that took place in the subcommittee as it relates to debt relief for the highly-indebted poor countries.

Just for the edification of the Members who are in this body who were not in attendance at that committee meeting, what we are considering here is a proposal in effect to forgive debt that has been accumulated by a number of heavily-indebted poor countries over the past years, the purpose of which would be to allow them to thereafter raise their standard of living, either by investing in infrastructure or in hospitals or schools or medical assistance, and care for their people, the people who live in those countries.

Keep in mind, this debate in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services took place this year, this being 2000. I just want to remind everyone that in the seventies and eighties when these loans were originally extended to these now highly-indebted poor countries, the loans and the grants and what have you were extended on the basis of providing these countries with the resources to raise their standard of living, to build roads and infrastructure and hospitals and schools.

So we find ourselves in the unique position today of in effect having in the seventies and eighties provided loans to raise the standard of living of these countries by virtue of investing in their infrastructure. Now we are going to forgive these loans so that these countries can raise the standard of living by virtue of investment in their infrastructure.

Let me just examine a little bit how we discussed this system would work within the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

As Members know, or as many know, we have various organizations around the world that are involved in investment in highly-indebted poor countries. We have the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, we have the World Bank, we have the IMF, we have various other things. Each of these institutions on their ledger sheets carry gold as an asset.

The manner in which we talked in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services about financing these loans to the highly-indebted poor countries, I just want Members to follow this, was we were going to take the gold that is on these balance sheets and unilaterally revalue it, and then we were going to take the difference between the book value of the gold on these balance sheets and the revalued value and basically collect interest on that difference and use it to relieve this debt.

□ 1945

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a more hobgoblin system by which we would conduct our financial affairs than to take what in effect is a rose that we hold at a value of \$5 and say it is now worth \$350 and take the difference of the \$345 and use it to finance this debt forgiveness. I mean if I did that in private business, I can tell my colleagues I would be on Bill Gates' level. I would welcome that opportunity. However, I cannot get away with that.

I do not see why it is that the Federal Government, that this Federal Government would enter into that kind of a financial exercise, the purpose of which would be to forgive loans for the purpose of raising a standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, keep in mind, that the original purpose of the loans was to assist these highly indebted poor countries with raising their standard of living, so having given the loan, having time passed, now we are going to forgive the loan for the purpose of allowing these highly indebted poor countries to raise their standard of living.

The debate in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services revolved around what constitutes a highly indebted poor country, and I would just like to share with the other members of this committee that the standard that was used was, if I recall correctly, the accumulated debt of the country as a percentage of its gross domestic product. It had no connection whatsoever to the amount of trade or commerce that a highly indebted poor country who would be extended this debt relief might engage in with the United States.

There was no connection between commerce with the United States and the relief of debt to these highly indebted poor countries. We discussed at length amongst some of us whether or not we should change that standard by which we extended debt relief to account for the needs of our friends like Mexico or some of the trading partners with whom we have substantial economic commerce and with whom we have very, very specific United States interest with which to protect.

I would submit to my colleagues, in wrapping up, that extending or providing debt relief on loans that were originally granted for the purpose of raising standards of living, but now to provide debt relief for the purpose of allowing those debtors to raise their standard of living is at best circuitous and at worst challenges even the most brilliant of our scientists in terms of the logic they are in.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out that the gold revaluation in which we got a lesson from the gentleman from

California (Mr. OSE) is completely and entirely irrelevant to this bill. We did authorize gold revaluation last year with regard to the IMF debt.

This is a bill which appropriates money for the development banks, so the gold revaluation issue, whether we like it or not, is not involved in this bill. This is a bill that appropriates dollars to deal with the development banks, not with the IMF which had the gold revaluation, but it is still more relevant than the reading of the GAO report of the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that last year, the House, the Senate and the administration engaged in what I would call and has been termed a historic act of grace, and it was designed to relieve the debt of the poorest nations of the world.

My interests came about actually on an airplane flight from the middle of America, from Iowa, back home to Westerville, and I read the New York Times and there was a picture of a B2 bomber, and the question was "what's the limits of America's power?"

When I read this article, I was really struck by the notion that while the United States has incredible military power, unprecedented military power and obviously now unprecedented economic power, many nations in the world were beginning to fear us, resent us. And as I thought about it, I thought if we have all of this power, and we do, it does not make any sense to not share some of the bounty that we have with those that have little.

I must tell my colleagues, I am not particularly interested in all the calculations that have been presented tonight, because I have been in Angola, and I have seen people hauled with half bodies through little villages as a result of a civil war. This is not designed to provide aid to people who are in the middle of a civil war, but it is designed to provide some help and some hope to people who have absolutely nothing.

The fact is that this resentment towards the United States has been growing. Last year, we had a historic act of grace that frankly was bipartisan in nature, and that, to some degree, disturbs me about the debate tonight.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), was, in fact, at the end of the day instrumental in being able to provide up to \$200 million in debt forgiveness and to permit the IMF to use some gold reserves in an additional effort to relieve the debt payments of the poorest of the poor. Is all of this going to be right? No.

I will tell my colleagues this, this Congress just this year appropriated \$100 million for local firefighters and EMS squads, and the last time I

checked my Republican philosophy, that did not fall into the category.

When we look at the amount of money that we waste on both sides of the aisle for projects, the simple fact of the matter is, the United States must do something to help alleviate poverty in this world. We cannot turn our back on people who have nothing.

Is it all going to work out right with the accountants? The answer is probably not. Foreign aid never does, because we are giving it to people who sometimes are the wrong people. But there is an effort in this bill and in this procedure to make sure that the money that we give to the poorest of the poor is going to be accounted for.

My feeling is that this bill is underfunded in this area. Some of us say lift the allocation. I am not interested in lifting the allocation. I am interested in priorities, and I think this ought to be a major priority. I think the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) should be complimented for what he did last year and let me say also that last year the people that engaged in the historic act of grace were people like the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT); the gentleman from Texas (Majority Leader ARMEY); my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); over in the Senate, Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD, Senator CONNIE MACK, Senator PAUL COVERDELL, a long list of Republicans and Democrats, who believe that it is essential that we use debt forgiveness as a way to provide some hope to the poorest of the poor.

A little bit of the concern that I have tonight, because I am going to be very involved again this year. I am going to be very involved in trying to make sure we do more to help the poorest of the poor, and I believe we will have support, strong support, at the end of the day from the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). Discussions were entered into yesterday with the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is very interested. And I tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we are going to need to fix the IMF. There may be some institutional changes that affects a body that all too many times has imposed the wrong economic principles on poor nations. And there is going to be a push for this kind of reform in the IMF.

The fact is that I think at the end of the day we will have a package, and it will be a package that will call for increased accountability for the money that goes to the poorest of the poor. There will be increased reform on the International Monetary Fund that has imposed many times the wrong economic prescriptions on poor nations, but I would suggest in this body that we not make this issue a partisan issue.

I can also say to the groups that have been so involved in this, we have to work with the Members. It is a foreign aid bill. It is not always the most popular bill at home. But at the end of the day, I believe that we can on a bipartisan, congressional and administration agreement reach out again to provide another historic act of grace that will give hope to people who today all too often have no help.

Let us try to work together and let us try to recognize that this solution must be bipartisan, will be bipartisan, and let us keep, as one effective politician in this country has said, let us keep hope alive.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). I come here tonight to strongly support the Pelosi amendment. It is troubling to see that we are using the General Accounting Office report as a litmus test for what we should do here in this Congress. To me, we have run out of procedural things to do and things that have common sense.

There are so many ironies that I have heard here tonight. We have given aid to people in civil wars. We have propped up dictators around the world. So tonight to come before this body and say because of someone buying an airplane that means that we are going to withhold the kind of relief which they need, it is disingenuous to do that. We know that is true. We have a moral obligation to work and help the continent of Africa.

Debt relief is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. We talk a good game here in terms of poverty. But are we going to do something about the countries who need it most? These countries have had to make drastic cuts in essential human services, such as health and education. Do we want the AIDS epidemic, which is now becoming a pandemic to reach this country? It will.

Those of us who know history know about the black death. We are not immune to any of these health problems. If my colleagues do not think we are, read the history of the World Health Organization. We are dealing with a very serious virus here. We must do something to relieve this.

Debt relief is nothing new to this country, many of it was accumulated during the Cold War. As long as there was Communism, I did not hear too much fight against it. We gave debt relief.

We know that these countries are supported now because we are giving it to them in a very small way, very little money. So these corrupt dictators, which we propped up over all the years, they are not there any more, these

countries are trying to straighten up and live within our guidelines.

The debt of the Congo was accumulated during the oppressive rule of Mobutu. Nicaragua's debt was accumulated during the dictatorship of the Somoza family and the subsequent civil war. It is unjust and immoral to expect the impoverished people of these countries to pay back these debts.

Mr. Chairman, all of us have heard of Jubilee 2000, those of my colleagues who profess Christianity and other kinds of religions, this is the year for us to come together and do some work for the poorest of the poor.

It is the right thing to do. The supporters of Jubilee 2000 now include a broad expanse of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religions. It is time for us to come together.

I rise to support the Pelosi amendment to increase funding for debt relief for the world's most impoverished countries.

As many of my colleagues know, debt relief is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. In Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda, government spending on debt service payments is greater than government spending on health and education combined. Tanzania spends four times as much money on debt payments as it does on health and education combined. The governments of these countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in essential human services such as health and education in order to make payments on their debts. These debt payments constitute a transfer of wealth from the world's poorest countries to the world's most wealthy countries.

Debt relief for the world's poorest countries is supported by a worldwide movement known as Jubilee 2000. This movement was begun by Christians who believe that the year 2000, the two thousandth anniversary of the coming of Christ, is a Jubilee Year. According to the Bible, the Lord instructed the people of Ancient Israel to celebrate a Jubilee—or a Year of the Lord—every 50 years. During a Jubilee Year, slaves were set free, and land was redistributed.

Activists know that forgiving the debts of the world's most impoverished countries in the Year 2000 is the right thing to do. Supporters of Jubilee 2000 now include a diverse group of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious groups, development specialists, labor unions, environmental groups and other non-governmental organizations.

Many of the debts owed by poor countries were accumulated during the Cold War, and many are the result of loans to corrupt dictators who are no longer in power. The debt of the Congo was accumulated during the oppressive rule of Mobutu. Nicaragua's debt was accumulated during the dictatorship of the Somoza family and the subsequent civil war. It is unjust and immoral to expect the impoverished people of these countries to pay back these debts. Supporters of Jubilee 2000 also know that debt relief is a moral imperative.

The Administration requested a mere \$225 million for debt relief for the world's poorest countries in fiscal year 2001. Unfortunately,

the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill includes only \$69.4 million in debt relief funds for these countries. The Pelosi amendment would increase debt relief appropriations to fully fund this modest request. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for yielding me the time, and let me also identify with his dilemma.

I think on behalf of the Congress, we all ought to recognize the difficulty the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has with dealing with a slight budget and enormous obligations. This is a difficult job. This budget as it is presented to the Congress recognizes a need for debt relief. It also recognizes that we are going to have to respond more forthcomingly with the AIDS challenge.

On the other hand, I think most of us recognize that these principles of concern are inadequately attended to because of the budgetary constraints we have, and I personally believe this Congress before we adjourn is going to have to do much, much more.

Debt relief is rooted, as the prior speaker, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) mentioned in the religious concept, the word jubilee, which derives from Leviticus, which implies a re-ordering of relationships, and one of the great questions in this jubilee 50-year reassessment, is whether it is worthy of being reassessed in this debt relief context?

If my colleagues look at the poorest of the poor countries in the world, many today have more obligations in terms of debt service than they can apply to education or health care.

□ 2000

In this circumstance, I think that the religious precept of Jubilee does compelling come into play, and it is no accident that religious leaders from the Pope to Billy Graham to Pat Robertson have endorsed debt relief in this Congress.

As far as health care is concerned, this world is confronted with the greatest health crisis in human history. Within a year or 2, more deaths will have occurred because of the AIDS virus than because of the bubonic plague of the 1300s. We have an obligation to respond and respond compassionately.

In terms of both debt relief and the AIDS crisis, committees of the Congress have responded in certain ways. We have authorizing legislation that has passed. Now it is the obligation of Congress to move forthcomingly to appropriate funds and, frankly, to give consideration to appropriating beyond the levels that have already been authorized.

But I would say at this point in time that, what this debate is all about, is making it clear to all sides that there is not just bipartisan, but American concern for the plight of people in the less developed world and an understanding that that plight cannot be isolated; it can come here to roost very quickly.

This happens to be the most compassionate set of initiatives in the history of the United States' Congress for the developing world. Debt relief and support for AIDS eradication and prevention is something we in this Congress simply have to address as the appropriations process continues.

Here, it must be stressed, Mr. Chairman, that debt relief and AIDS prevention are intertwined. Intertwined because there is belated but growing recognition that a stronger commitment is needed to combat the HIV/AIDS pandemic, but that many poor countries—particularly in hard-hit Sub-Saharan Africa—owe several times more in debt payments than what their governments are spending on basic health and education.

I recognize the extraordinary budgetary constraints that Chairman CALLAHAN confronted in trying to fashion an adequate response to both issues and remain hopeful that substantial additional funding for debt relief and for the House-approved World Bank AIDS Trust Fund can be secured as the appropriations process moves forward.

Last year debt relief received strong, bipartisan support in Congress, and important strides were made toward achieving debt relief for the world's poorest countries. As Members recall, last November Congress appropriated \$123 million to begin canceling the debts that reforming poor countries owe the United States, and agreed that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) can use \$2.3 billion of its own resources to finance its contribution to debt relief. In this regard, the Banking Committee fully authorized U.S. participation in international debt relief efforts during the first session of the 106th Congress (H.R. 1095, Rept. 106-483). The core of that debt relief bill was included in last year's consolidated appropriations package.

The Committee's authorizing language specified a number of conditions that countries must meet in order to receive debt relief. Countries must perform satisfactorily under an economic reform program, promote civil society participation, implement anti-corruption measures and transparent policymaking, adopt strategies for poverty reduction, and strengthen private sector growth, trade, and investment. Consistent with current law, the program excludes from eligibility countries that systematically violate human rights, support terrorism, or have excessive military spending.

However, Congress still needs to approve U.S. contributions to help defray the costs of regional development banks, such as the Inter-American Development Bank, to allow them to do their part in the international debt relief effort. Crucially, every dollar of the U.S. contribution will leverage \$20 in multilateral debt relief. In addition, Congress also needs to authorize the IMF to fully mobilize the interest earnings on the off-market gold sales that occurred last year, solely to finance debt relief.

It is self-evident that debt relief alone cannot solve the problems of hunger and poverty. But when debt relief is coupled with credible economic and social reforms, it can help be a catalyst for economic growth. Sound debt relief programs can help free up resources for poverty reduction, basic human needs, HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, child survival and environmental protection. By helping to put countries on the path toward sustainable development, debt relief can also benefit the U.S. economy through expanded trade and investment ties.

More broadly, securing full funding for debt relief remains a key legislative priority for a broad spectrum religious leader—from the Pope to Pat Robertson and the Reverend Billy Graham—who have endorsed the call for debt relief.

On the AIDS front, the release of the latest UNAIDS report just last month underscores the horrific impact HIV/AIDS is having around the globe, particularly in hard-hit sub-Saharan Africa. The stunning statistics on the rapid advance of this disease, despite what medically-advanced countries know to be effective preventive measures, represents a profound indictment of the international community and the leaders of nations most severely impacted. Experts predict that HIV/AIDS will soon become the worst epidemic of infectious disease in recorded history, eclipsing both the bubonic plague of the 1300's which killed an estimated 20 million and the influenza epidemic of 1918–19 which killed 18 million.

Already, according to the latest UNAIDS data, the death toll from HIV/AIDS stands at 18.8 million, including a heartbreaking 3.8 million children under the age of 15. Around the world, another 34.3 million are living with this disease. Of that total, 24.5 million live in sub-Saharan Africa, a disproportionate 70 percent of the world's victims in a region with just 10 percent of the world's population. Infection rates in some countries are nothing short of shocking: a 35.8 percent infection rate among adults in Botswana and a rate in South Africa of 19.9%. And the disease has left in its wake 13.2 million orphans, the vast majority of them in Africa.

What is also alarming is that even international health experts have been wrong about the pace at which this disease would spread. In 1991, the WHO estimated that 9 million would be infected and 5 million dead from AIDS in Africa by 1999. Eight years later, we find that the casualty rates are nearly triple that estimate.

In parts of Africa where the epicenter currently resides, as well as South Asia and the Caribbean where the disease is fast moving, AIDS and the precipitating HIV virus have jumped well beyond the population groups considered most at risk in America. Millions of women now have the HIV virus and it is being transferred in the womb to the unborn. Indeed, by virtually any measure, the global HIV/AIDS epidemic may be fairly described as a plague of Biblical proportions.

Experts also warn that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is no longer singularly a health issue; it has become a major issue for economic development. Assessments by World Bank officials call HIV/AIDS "the foremost and fastest-growing threat to development" in Africa.

Yet, as bleak as the global picture is, we know that there are effective HIV/AIDS prevention and education strategies. They are being successfully implemented in many Western developed countries as well as in such countries as Uganda and Senegal in Africa, and in Thailand in Asia. Those prevention and education strategies must be replicated many times over in a vastly greater number of countries.

Clearly the United States has a strong national interest in combating the HIV/AIDS crisis abroad as well as at home. Infectious diseases, like HIV/AIDS, know no borders. The number of Americans travelling overseas—often to countries with high risks of infectious diseases—has doubled in the last ten years, with more than 57 million travelling abroad in 1998. Millions of Americans and their families also struggle with HIV/AIDS and there are few among us who have not directly or indirectly experienced the loss of friends or family to this disease.

While it remains the paramount responsibility of national and community leaders in each country to exercise strong leadership and commitment in dealing with the HIV/AIDS crisis, the United States, other governments, and non-governmental organizations—including private business, religious and humanitarian organizations—must be partners in providing critical resources and medical knowledge.

At present, international donors—including the United States—provide an estimated \$350 million a year to address the HIV/AIDS problem in Africa. Yet, experts tell us that over eight times that amount—or roughly \$3 billion—is actually needed to do the job. This extraordinary need for resources—and the reality of the budget constraints which limit our bilateral assistance efforts—underscore the urgent need for a change in U.S. strategy to emphasize a much stronger multilateral, "burden-sharing" approach to this crisis. It is my hope that as the appropriations process unfolds, additional resources for HIV/AIDS can be found to fund the innovation approach outlined in the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund, as passed by the House. This proposal offers the U.S. the opportunity to catalyze a much stronger global response to the AIDS epidemic. Implicit in approaches involving Bretton Woods institutions is the possibility of attracting additional contributions from other donors including, as uniquely authorized in H.R. 3519, the private sector. For a modest \$100 million contribution from the U.S., it is my hope that we can leverage enough contributions from other donors—governmental and private—to reach a total of \$1 billion a year for the trust fund.

In conclusion, let me stress that America has a particular obligation to do everything within its power to prevent and, ultimately, eradicate HIV/AIDS, particularly among its most vulnerable victims—children. Mortality may be a part of the human condition, but all of us have an obligation to put an end to conditions that precipitate premature death, particularly at young ages. Clearly, no nation is better positioned than the United States, with its wealth and research capacity, to lead the world in this cause. For the U.S. to fail to lead at this critical juncture in history would be moral dereliction. Out of a sense of self-pres-

ervation for mankind itself, if not simply humanitarian concern for those currently affected, this disease must be eradicated, whatever the cost. Before the 106th Congress adjourns, it is my hope that we will have the resolve and courage to meet this challenge.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. I commend him for his service on this issue and many others of concern to people of our country and throughout the world. I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his favorably disposed presentation toward the thrust of my amendment.

I want to just state that this must be a bipartisan effort in the House of Representatives, and that is what we will all be working toward. Hopefully, at the end of the day, our position will prevail in a bipartisan way that we will fully fund the President's request for fiscal year 2000 and 2001 to meet our obligations to the G-7 and to the poorest people in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and has long been active in these issues of justice throughout the world.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been, at times, an ugly debate; but then we should not expect anything else. This is an ugly bill.

There are multiple reasons to oppose this legislation, and I do oppose it. But the utter callousness of the cuts in what is really a very modest debt relief funding that has been asked by the administration, by the President of the United States, is reason enough to oppose the legislation.

The President asked for \$472 million for debt relief program for this year, and that was cut by 82 percent to a total of \$82 million. That is even more than a one-third cut from what was made available last year in the area of debt relief.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be folly to try to find what is common ground in a situation like this, but I do think that we can probably all agree that there are some, maybe many developing nations that have experienced declining economic conditions while accumulating higher levels of debt which are largely owed to the international lending institutions, the multilateral public lending agencies, the IMF, the World Bank, also to foreign governments, and the U.S. Government. I think we all would agree that that has happened.

Since 1989, the G-7 countries, at that time Canada, Japan, the U.S., Italy,

Britain, Germany, and France, that seven, in recognizing that this mounting debt burden for some borrowers had undermined economic growth and even their capacity to finance absolutely basic social and even health programs started setting policies and extending a series of debt relief arrangements.

The most recent of those arrangements is the HPIC arrangement this last year. Now, the 41 nations in the HPIC arrangement, which are the nations of the heavily indebted poor countries, those 41 nations include four from Latin America, four from Asia, and 33 from Africa. Ninety percent of American debt among those 41 nations is in that group of 33 from Africa.

It is interesting that, of all that debt, which the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), one of the previous speakers, had pointed out, that the total debt in those nations had increased to \$169 billion. Only \$6 billion of that is debt to the United States, debt to this government.

We are a Nation which has 25 percent of the wealth of this world, of this whole planet, and 25 percent of the whole economic base of this whole planet; and something like under 4 percent of the debt to these poorest of the poor nations is owed to the United States.

These nations in Africa are the nations in sub-Saharan Africa who are suffering the worst of the AIDS epidemic, the worst of HIV/AIDS. There are nations there where one-third of all the adults are suffering from HIV/AIDS. There are nations there where as many as half of all the 15-year-old kids can expect to die of AIDS.

There are nations where, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) earlier pointed out, more money is expended on the debt relief, their payment of debt in some of those nations than they pay for all of health and all of education, all of their social programs. I have heard, though I cannot confirm this by any particular report, that in cases, it is as much as four times as much as going to attempt to pay for that debt that has been built up.

Yet, in this instance, the 82 percent cut in the program that the President asked for, cuts from the President's request, the reduction in the President's request from \$472 million to \$82 million, deliberately attacks the very program, the HPIC program which had been worked out by the G-8 nations as a way of dealing with the debts in these very poorest of countries.

Now, I just want to remind my colleagues that, and this has been alluded to by others as well, in the calendar years 1990 through 1992, there were a series of initiatives of debt reduction totalling more than \$10 billion; actually it is slightly more than \$12 billion. They included a debt forgiveness for Poland of \$2.5 billion. They included a

debt forgiveness for military aid loans to Egypt of \$7 billion, a debt forgiveness of some \$700 million that went to African and Latin American nations, and debt forgiveness that went to a series of African and Latin American nations and Bangladesh and Asia totalling more than \$2 billion, all of them authorized and approved by this Congress under President George Bush, the former President George Bush; all of them approved at that time totalling \$12 billion.

Here we are, we are now taking the callous position that we should cut the effort by the G-8 nations in the HPIC countries, the poorest of the poor, cut the President's proposal from \$472 million to \$82 million. It is virtually unconscionable, and it is for that reason that I support the gentlewoman's amendment that is before us today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in support of the Pelosi amendment, and I do so because I have been told that to those to whom much is given, much is desired and expected in return. In reality, we are given much in this country; and we are simply being asked to share some of what we have with some of the most needy people in all of the world.

When we talk about the paltry sum that we are talking about providing now for debt relief for Africa and the Latin American countries, it reminds me of a system of share cropping, where individuals get just enough, where no matter how hard they work, no matter what it is that they do, they can never get out of debt, and they just keep working. When they do that, they lose hope. They lose the feeling that tomorrow is going to be brighter than yesterday.

So I would hope that we would recognize that the greatest gift that we can give to ourselves is the gift of hope to those who are hopeless and those who are helpless. I would urge passage of the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have any more speakers. I reserve the balance of my time and right to close.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 37½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 32½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I stand in strong support

of her amendment and say the issue that we are talking about is very, very important. In fact, this bill is very important. But somehow it is very difficult for us to understand that foreign affairs and foreign relations, the monies we spend in aid really enable us as a country to be far more secure.

The issue we are talking about tonight, about debt relief, is a tool we have used to further our relationship with a number of countries historically. We do this as a way of enabling the country to be responsive. We do that as a way of enabling us to have better relationships. We did that with the Soviet Union. We have done that with other countries. We do that historically.

But here we are with a unique opportunity in a unique time, the year of the Jubilee 2000, all of the religious groups, and I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the subcommittee, not only did the poor support this, but the Protestant religions support this, the nonprofit groups support this because it is the right thing to do. It is right to, indeed, share what one has with others.

But the year of Jubilee is a time, 50-year time that says that we reexamine the debt we have as a part of our sharing our wealth with the world. I think that, as we consider this, we have to consider when we relieve the debt, we are enabling those countries to be responsible in self-development of their country, by investing in their education, investing in their health; or otherwise we are taking the monies that we know they cannot afford to pay, indeed, paying a debt oftentimes that has gone in by another regime that was completely irresponsible.

So I strongly support this amendment. It is the right thing to do. Our country owes it to ourselves to make sure we share our wealth, and it is in our security to do it.

□ 2015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

As I listened to the debate this afternoon and evening I do say to the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), that we have had an opportunity to work together, and I am reminded of the support he gave me in increasing the African Development Fund when I first came to Congress some one million dollars. So I know that he is a fair person and wants to do the right thing. But I think in his debating and discussion this evening that he is misdirected in his angst or his disappointment.

This is not the time to utilize the expending of a nation's funds, as he spoke

of Uganda and President and Mrs. Museveni, who are people that I know and have worked with. Uganda is one of the shining stars in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and expends a large amount of its budget, which can be documented, to fight, treat and prevent AIDS in Uganda. I know the ambassador, Ambassador Ssempala, who is a strong leader on these issues. And I believe that was the wrong example for it begins to say that we dictate to countries what their needs are.

I support the gentlewoman's amendment of adding some \$390 million to the paltry \$82 million, which is really more than a shame. It does not in any way suggest that America is who America should be, and that is a world leader and an investor in helping people lift themselves up. I am reminded of the phrase "Do not give them a fish but teach them to fish." That is what debt relief is all about. It is to ensure that countries who faithfully secure funds from their own population are able to use those dollars not for long-standing debt relief but for food and housing and for health care. That is what this investment means.

How can the chairman, in good conscience, when the administration asks for \$472 million, put in the budget \$82 million? That is punitive, that is a shame, and that is not befitting of this body.

I would simply say when people are dying in droves in Africa of HIV/AIDS, this is not a time to make an accusation about an airplane. This is a time to stand up and support this amendment and to relieve them of the burden that is unfair so that they can invest in world peace and world calm and we can live together as brothers and sisters.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of her very important amendment.

Before we discuss the particulars of the amendment, I think we need to look at what the base bill does. The base bill makes deep cuts in funds available for loans to the world's neediest countries. That has been said rather repeatedly here.

The 32 percent cut in funding for the International Development Association would severely impact the financing of investments in health, clean water supplies, education and other infrastructure needed to reduce poverty. Additional cuts are made in funding for the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the Asian Development Fund, and the Inter-American Investment Corporation.

The reality is that what we are doing here is crushing nations that have been pretty much crushed to the ground. By allowing the debt to continue to run

and interest to rise on it, we ultimately affect all such particulars that we would not want to as a fair-minded nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, what are we talking about tonight? I want to quote from Charles Dickens. "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us, we had nothing before us."

In 1859, it was the Tale of Two Cities, today, sadly, it is the tale of two worlds, one very rich, one very poor. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about two worlds, and we are talking about what our world will do to help the other world.

What is the cost of our world helping the other world? Doing what is right, whatever the material cost, should always be the imperative. Nevertheless, let us attempt to count the cost, the cost of acting and the cost of not acting. When we do, I cannot in good faith fail to embrace this unique opportunity to help so many at such a small cost to ourselves.

What is the cost of debt relief? At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce into the record what that cost would be for each citizen this year, and it is \$1.20. I would like to submit that for the record: \$1.20.

It is a nominal amount, it is a minimal amount, but it is not an insignificant amount or an inconsequential amount when we realize what it can do for that other world. It is the cost of an ice cream cone. It is the cost of a gallon of gas. In fact, a half gallon of gas. It is the cost of a Sunday paper.

Against this minuscule sacrifice for our world, what is the cost of not acting? Today, in dozens of poor countries all over the world, little boys and girls are born into poverty, disease and hunger. We in America are fond of saying, "I had a bad day." We should realize that even on our worst days we are blessed with so much more; more food, more shelter, more clothes, more security, more than our poor brothers and sisters are on their best days.

We truly cannot comprehend what their day is like. However, I am going to attempt to do so with one quote from Sister Rebecca Trujillo of the Sisters of Notre Dame in Nicaragua. Here is what she writes about the plight of the poor.

"Often in my life," she says, "when I talk about the needs of the poor with whom I work, people say, how do they survive? How do they survive? Since being in Nicaragua, I have taken to answer in a matter of fact way, 'Often they do not.' " That is what we are here tonight to decide, whether they survive or whether they do not.

Let me illustrate, in closing, the cost of not acting as it applies to 15 baby girls and baby boys born today into the poorest of countries. Of those 15, without debt relief, three will die before his or her fifth birthday. Of the remaining 12, four will suffer the scourge of malnutrition, with permanent consequences to their physical and mental development. Of the remaining eight, they are in no way fortunate. Their chances of graduating from high school, of drinking clean water, of suffering disease and deprivation, of being orphaned are great, sometimes as much as 50-50. Their burdens are day-to-day, they are painful, they are heavy.

We in America have been blessed with a period of almost unparalleled economic prosperity. Never in our history has one country had so much progress, wealth and luxury. Now, with the start of a new millennium, we can do so much for a billion of the poorest citizens of the world. I believe they are our brothers and sisters. At such a small cost to each of us, what a shame if history should look back on us today and say that we passed up so great an opportunity.

The responsibility is ours and ours alone. Our moral imperative is not qualified by the rest of the world failing to do what is right. We cannot use other countries' inaction as an excuse for our inaction. The decision is ours.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would say the decision is three things: First, it is a decision that will follow us. For the people living in these poor countries, their suffering is temporal. It will end with their lives. For us, the decision will follow us. We will not only live with this in this life, but we will live with it in the next.

Second, the decision will define us. It will define us as either a loving people, a people filled with grace and compassion, or it will define us as a people focused on the monetary, the temporal.

And third, and I think this is most important, this is not a decision that the poor countries of the world will make, it is our decision. We have the responsibility, we have the obligation, and we have the direction as to what is the right thing to do. For this decision, whether we are a follower of the Islam religion, whether we are a Muslim, whether we are Christian, or whether we are Jewish, all those religions give us a moral imperative in such a case, and that imperative is to act.

To me, there is really only one decision.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in

thanksgiving for the beautiful testimony of our previous speaker, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), and thank him for that statement and for his incredible leadership on this issue of international debt forgiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a member of the subcommittee and an active champion for debt relief.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago this Congress was filled with ambassadors who proclaimed that they wanted trade not aid. Why is that? Because, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the economic elite of every country are really the primary beneficiaries of the global economy.

But it is not trade that is ravaging the people of sub-Saharan Africa and South America, HIV and AIDS are. More than 60 percent of the export earning potential of these countries associated with trade is being used for debt service. It is not being used for health care or for education. My colleague from Massachusetts made that very clear.

□ 2030

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear what we believe the problem to be, because we heard a number of our colleagues from the other side come to the floor and talk about responsible governments in sub-Saharan Africa. We spent billions here in America educating people in English and in Spanish about HIV and AIDS.

There are 1,500 languages in sub-Saharan Africa, and they cannot possibly educate their people about the devastating disease and maintain these debt payments. We spend billions to educate 280 million people in America. There are 750 million sub-Saharan Africans, and they cannot educate themselves and make these payments.

There are 5,000 sub-Saharan Africans who are dying a day in the villages, in the cities. The disease to many of them is not HIV or AIDS, it is surrounded by myth and superstition. Why? Because there are hundreds of religions in sub-Saharan Africa. And so every time, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues argue that at some point in time in the near future we will address debt relief and we will condition that debt relief upon no future loans, we are actually making it more and more difficult for sub-Saharan Africans to educate their own people about the nature of the problem.

That is why some of us have called for unconditional debt forgiveness. But even if the Congress of the United States, Mr. Chairman, does not support unconditional debt forgiveness, the conditions should be placed upon that debt forgiveness on the use of those resources for the education, the health care, and the housing of their people.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) may control the time at this point controlled by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the gentleman yields 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

There was no objection.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I do not expect to use the entire amount of time. But I simply want to, first of all, associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), who gave a very moving and stirring speech a few moments ago and pointed out that what we are talking about is providing an appropriate amount of relief for a cost of only a little over a dollar per citizen in the United States, something which I believe almost all of us can afford quite readily. In fact, I would be willing to pay quite a bit more than that in order to cover the payment for those who cannot do so.

I would just also comment, I am aware that this issue is likely to be ruled out of order and, therefore, not to be voted on today. I would also add that I am a cosponsor of the authorizing bill which will deal with this issue. I believe it is very important that we address it.

There are many issues to be raised regarding this as to how to handle it appropriately, how to ensure that the relief that is given will be used in a meaningful way to aid the people for whom it is intended and a whole host of other issues. But the key point is simply that we are dealing with nations that are struggling for breath, that are dealing with huge amounts not just of poverty but of illness, that are almost immobilized by AIDS and other diseases; and it is incumbent upon us, as the wealthiest Nation in the world, to share some of our abundance with them.

I would also note, Mr. Chairman, that of the developed nations which are sharing their abundance with the poorer nations, the United States still, to the best of my knowledge, contributes the least per capita of any of the developed nations. This is not a record of which I am proud, and I hope we can improve that.

The key, however, is to make certain that the aid we provide does in fact alleviate the situation, does help those in need, and does improve the situation in those nations which need help.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished Democratic Whip of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her leadership on this issue. I would like to also congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for her leadership on this issue.

There are so many people who have been active on this and who have shown leadership. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), my colleague, for his comments and, as he pointed out, a beautiful statement by our friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. Chairman, I have seldom been prouder of the House of Representatives than I am tonight listening to this debate. It is an extraordinary outpouring of concern and love and care for people who need our love and our concern and certainly our care in a very critical time.

St. Augustine once said that charity is no substitute for justice withheld. And I think today we face the question of justice. Clearly it is before us.

It has been estimated that the nations of sub-Saharan Africa now owe foreign creditors an average of almost \$400 for every man, woman, and child. That is more than most Africans earn in a year. And that is why these nations now spend more to repay debt than they do on primary education or on health care.

In Tanzania, a nation where 40 percent of the population dies before the age of 35, the government today is forced to spend nine times more on debt repayment than it spends on health care. Debt relief is not about charity. It is about justice. And in this case, Mr. Chairman, it is about human survival. It is about helping to save millions of children from hunger and disease and helping prevent whole nations from falling even deeper into an abyss of poverty and neglect.

It has been said that justice is so subtle a thing that to interpret it, one has only the need of a heart. It is up to us today to look into our heart, and it is up to us to remember that the true measure of America's strength is not only our wealth, it is our compassion. I urge support of the Pelosi and Waters effort to provide lasting debt relief to save human lives and to effect justice.

I would daresay, Mr. Chairman, no matter what the outcome of this is today or this evening, that I sense from this Chamber that there is a majority of Members in this body who want to do something and do something substantial on this issue. And I hope we address this issue before we adjourn for the year.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the international AIDS conference is happening right now in South Africa with countries around the world coming together to address the issue of AIDS.

I ask my colleagues, what is the position of the United States on this issue? We are ready to fight off the boogeyman with a \$60 billion defense

system. But the real boogeyman is AIDS, and we are standing by while it wipes out millions of people in Africa. And, folks, we are not excluded.

AIDS in Africa is a direct threat to our country, especially in today's interconnected world. It is no coincidence that recent reports show that just as AIDS cases in Africa are on the rise, AIDS in the United States is on the increase again. In fact, experts are predicting that 40,000 new infections will occur this year.

The boogeyman is here, folks; and we are going to be in serious trouble if we do not stop him. Debt relief is something that is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. There are countries that have been forced to make major cuts in health and educational spending in order to pay their debt. I do not understand how we can debate \$20 million for debt relief, and yet in the weeks to come my colleagues will come to this floor to support \$60 billion on a cartoon defense plan.

Even though our heads may be in the sand, the boogeyman is already here. It is wiping out communities in this country, too.

Debt relief is something that is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. These are countries that have been forced to make drastic cuts in health and education spending in order to make payments on their debts. I don't understand how we can debate \$200 million for debt relief, and yet in the weeks to come my colleagues will be on this floor supporting \$60 billion on a cartoon defense plan.

Even though our heads seem to be in the sand, the boogeyman is already here. It's wiping out communities in this country too. The only way we can stop him is through stopping the AIDS virus, and one of the best ways to do that is through debt relief. I rise in opposition to this bill because it fails to address some of the most critical issues in the world—debt relief and the international AIDS crisis that is wiping out the continent of Africa.

In Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda, government spending on debt service payments is greater than government spending on health and education combined! 4.2 million South Africans are currently infected with HIV. If these countries were granted debt relief, they would be better equipped to pay for health services for AIDS, which is ravaging the continent.

Almost half of all 15 year olds in the African countries worst affected by AIDS will eventually die. AIDS has wiped out households, destroyed families emotionally and economically, severely damaged entire economies, and in some countries, has killed so many teachers that it is beginning to affect basic education. Life expectancy in southern Africa is expected to drop to 30.

This disease has created 8 million "AIDS orphans," who face increased risk of malnutrition and will have very little opportunity to get an education.

Was debt relief really ever given serious consideration in this Congress? No. Even

though it was stated on the floor during this same debate in 1998 that "AIDS had the potential for undermining all development efforts to date," many here in Washington still believe that assisting Africa is not in the interests of the United States. We do not live in a vacuum. AIDS in Africa is a direct threat to our country, especially in today's interconnected world.

I urge my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment and treat the situation in Africa for what it is, a crisis.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the many Members on both sides of the aisle who are participating in this evening's debate. I am especially pleased that the last four or five speakers on the Republican side give us hope that we will be able to reach a bipartisan resolution to the question that is before us this evening.

I was, of course, inspired by the statement of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), encouraged by the statement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), always taught by the statement of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and so pleased to have expressions of support from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

So I am hopeful that when we go down this path the funding will be sufficient and the policy will match the need that we have for debt relief.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, in his beautiful remarks of support of international debt relief commented that something like \$1.20 for every American would cover what we are trying to do here tonight and spoke very poignantly about that being the cost of an ice cream or Sunday paper. I could not help but think of some other statistics.

The World Bank estimates that sub-Saharan African countries owe foreign creditors an average of almost \$400 for every man, woman and child, more than most Africans make in a year. More than \$400 for every person is owed. This can be resolved by \$1.20 for every American, a small price to pay to unleash an enormous amount of money relatively speaking to the economies of those countries that would solve the problem of \$400. One dollar solves the problem of \$400 for every person in sub-Saharan Africa.

Some of my colleagues have referenced the statistics. The writer George Bernard Shaw once wrote that the true sign of an intelligent person was that he or she was swayed and persuaded by statistics. I do not know if that is true, but the statistics here are staggering and I think very compelling

and bear repeating if they have already been stated.

In Mozambique, one of every four children dies before the age of five due to infectious disease. Yet the government spends four times more on debt servicing than on health care.

In Tanzania, where 40 percent of the population dies before the age of 35, the government spends nine times more on foreign debt payments than on health care, according to Oxfam. We have heard these statistics, and they go on and on.

But I am really quite taken by the spirit of how this debate evolved this evening. And in that spirit, I wanted to quote from Bernard Cardinal Law, the Archbishop of Boston, and chairman of the International Policy Committee of the United States Catholic Conference.

He says, "I am particularly disturbed by the woefully inadequate allocation for poor country debt relief. Last year's legislation supporting the new, more generous debt relief program agreed that the Cologne summit gave promise of a Jubilee Year 2000 that would bring hope to millions of impoverished children, women, and men around the world."

□ 2045

I hope that we will take the hope that Cardinal Bernard Law references here and make it tangible in terms of the appropriation that we need at the end of the day.

I just want to say, though, in the larger context of assistance to other countries, what we do for other countries is largely what is in our national interest to do. It is a part of a vision of who we think we are as a country, and we think we are great, and we are great. And as other Members have indicated tonight, it would be a sign of our greatness for us to recognize the responsibilities that we have internationally.

It is about the knowledge that we have and, as I have said before, the diversity that we have in this body empowers us but gives us also the responsibility to do something about the issues that are before us. Our members of the Congressional Black Caucus, of the Hispanic Caucus, of the Asian-Pacific American Caucus know the cultures, the economies, the opportunities and the needs and the urgency in the countries of their knowledge. We should build a plan on that knowledge, and we have. The President has agreed to it, he has to return next week to the G7 meeting to answer for it. Unfortunately, we will not have the opportunity to give him the funding he needs to go there. But hopefully he can take a message that all signs are hopeful that Congress will meet the President's request of \$472 million for international debt relief to meet the fiscal year 2000 obligation and the fiscal year 2001, both of which I hope will be contained in this bill.

It is not about doing anybody a favor. It is about the recognition that this is in our national interest. It is about the idea that infectious disease knows no boundary. I would hope that a spirit of compassion would be enough to compel us to do this, but it has a pragmatic aspect of it, and, that is, as I said, infectious disease knows no boundary. And we know that as we see AIDS raging through Africa, Asia and spreading to the rest of the world, even the increase in the United States when we are so enlightened about the subject. And it is again about the spirit of who we are as a country. I think the American people expect and the American people deserve that we do our best to represent us not only as a great country but as a good country.

As I have been talking, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that some of our colleagues who had requested time would return to the floor. May I ask of the Chair, are we going to have a motion to rise, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not heard such a motion. The Chair will entertain such a motion when offered.

Ms. PELOSI. I had been told that there might be an intervention into our debate.

Mr. CALLAHAN. We are waiting for the gentlewoman to consume her time and once she does there very possibly could be a temporary motion to rise.

Ms. PELOSI. I appreciate the gentleman saying that, but that was my point exactly. If there is going to be a motion to rise, I would reserve my time and use it for other colleagues.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Before we do that, we would like for you to either finish your discussion on this issue or I will ask for my point of order.

Ms. PELOSI. I see. The gentleman is clear.

Mr. Chairman, in that case I may have another speaker available.

Mr. CALLAHAN. We have no more speakers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I want to thank her for her eloquence and commitment, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) raising the question as to whether we have a moral imperative to act, and that we do.

Might I put into the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, the very points that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) was making, and I simply want to say to the gentlewoman, you realize that Honduras had a terrible, terrible hurricane in 1998. Right now a Honduran makes \$838 a year, and similar to the \$1.20, that is a television set, and they owe some \$3 billion in debt. If we were to help the Honduran government, this is what they could do. They could im-

prove basic health services for at least 100,000 people, and they could hire 1,000 new teachers among other projects.

To the gentlewoman, I simply believe this goes to my point of not giving a fish but teaching people to fish. How can they pay \$3.3 billion in debt and how can other nations around the world fighting off AIDS be able to do so with the enormous debt?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since the gentlewoman ended on the word AIDS, I just wanted to pick up on that for a moment and say that if you compound AIDS with poverty, you have a very, very deadly formula. These subjects are very definitely related. In the course of the evening we will have an amendment on AIDS, but we will not have as much time to debate that issue. But this issue of the debt forgiveness is not unrelated to the spread of AIDS in these countries which have inadequate access to quality health care and to education and, therefore, prevention.

I also wanted to make the point that it is in our national interest because disease knows no boundary, nor does environmental degradation. So I am very pleased that the American Lands Alliance, the Friends of the Earth, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the International Rivers Network, Environmental Defense, Rain Forests International, and World Wildlife Fund have all written in support of our amendment, indicating that when poor countries place their environment in jeopardy, they will frequently have to liquidate their natural resources as a quick way to service their debt. We do not want that to happen. That is why it is very important for us for personal, environmental, health, economic, cultural, political, for every reason to do the right thing by supporting the President's request on debt forgiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I am glad to be on the floor to strongly support her amendment. This is a question not only of moral imperative but of national importance. The question is not a question of charity towards other countries. The question is what is in the national interest of the United States in the context of debt relief.

This bill contains only \$69 million of the \$472 million of the administration's request for debt relief, and that amount of aid will not even provide enough resources to enable two countries, Bolivia and Mozambique, for example, who have met all the necessary conditions to obtain debt relief, to actually get it. The bill already short-

changes our friends and neighbors in Africa and Latin America and elsewhere and most significantly in that part which is the most significant program that offers highly indebted peoples the greatest hope for digging themselves out of the pits of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard many of my colleagues here speak over the course of the last several years about illegal immigration. When people flee their countries, they flee because of civil wars or they flee because of poverty. We spent in Latin America, for example, in the decade of the 1980s well over a billion dollars to promote democracy. And once we believed that we achieved that, we abandoned those countries, and overwhelmingly in the hemisphere where 40 percent of the people live below the poverty level, what do we do? We have basically said that we no longer have a commitment to you. Yet when people cross that border, they are crossing because they are fleeing poverty or because they are fleeing oppression in their own countries.

When people, in fact, are ill, that knows no borders. The diseases that have now begun to spring up here within the hemisphere know no borders. We are not immune as a country in that regard. When we talk about biodiversity issues and we are concerned about the quality of air here and we are concerned about the diminution of the rain forests throughout Central America, the Caribbean and into the rest of Latin America and we say, "Don't cut down your rain forests," but by the same token we give them no relief so that in fact they will not face a mountain of debt in which they will seek to do whatever they need to do in order to meet their national needs.

So this is not about them. This is about us. The gentlewoman's amendment is not a question of charity. It is not even in the context of the spirit of the religious orders of this country about the golden jubilee. It is about the national interest of the United States, whether you talk about in the context of immigration, whether you talk about in the context of disease, whether you talk about in the context of the environment, and how much more are we willing to spend for the meager amount that the debt relief would provide in terms of a beneficial consequence to those countries, how much more are we willing to spend when those countries turn, as we are seeing serious questions within the hemisphere, turn away from democracy and open markets and turn into a renewal of totalitarian governments? Then we will spend billions of dollars to defend democracy. But when we could spend just millions to preserve and promote democracy, we will not. It is not only shortsighted, it does not meet the moral imperative that we clearly have, it does not meet the national interest that we have.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. It is an amendment that pursues the national interest of the United States, and I would venture to say within this hemisphere even the national security of the United States.

And, lastly, our friends have spoken eloquently here about the pandemic that we see in the question of AIDS. That also knows no borders. It knows no color. It knows no gender. And in fact we have a serious consequence if we do not respond. We cannot silently sit by with our eyes closed believing that this major international health consequence will not ultimately come upon the shores of the United States and that there will be no consequence to us. Those who believe that despite all of their claims of internationalism in terms of trade are myopic when they are unwilling to give the type of debt relief as simple and as meager as it might be here but which is significant to these countries.

I urge the support of the gentlewoman's amendment, in our interest, in average Americans' interest, in the national interest of the United States and ultimately so that we can meet the moral imperative and be the beacon of light to the rest of the world that we should be.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Then I will have to yield the gentleman from Virginia 1½ minutes to close for our side.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her attempted generosity. I will do what I can.

Ms. PELOSI. Perhaps the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, after he hears what I have to say probably not, because I support the Pelosi amendment very strongly and I do not support this bill. It is the wrong bill from a diplomatic standpoint, from an economic standpoint and perhaps most importantly from a moral standpoint. In many ways it is like walking down the street seeing a starving kid with his hand out in front of a store front, putting your hand on a couple of bucks and then decide, no, and walking in the store and buying yourself a cigar instead.

Why are we doing this? Why are we so dramatically cutting debt relief, family planning, the assistance that starving people in Asia and particularly in Africa need, the health care, the educational assistance? We are doing it to give ourselves a trillion dol-

lar tax cut. That is the only reason we got such stringent allocations to our appropriations subcommittees, so we can afford a trillion dollar tax cut.

We are the wealthiest nation in the history of the world. In fact, one-earner families making \$40,000 are paying 5 percent on average in Federal income taxes. Two-earner families making \$70,000 on average pay 10 percent. We have never been better off. We have never had more capacity to do what is right for the rest of the world. And so here when we are confronted with the opportunity to do what is right, to change the lives of millions of people, one-quarter of the population in many of these African countries are dying of AIDS. Think of the suffering. We can relieve that suffering. Instead we decide to give ourselves a trillion dollar tax cut. It is wrong and it is immoral.

STATUS AND MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On June 27, the House Appropriations Committee ordered reported its version of the FY2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations (H.R. 4811), providing \$13.3 billion, about \$200 million less than the FY2000 Act (after adjusting for Wye River aid package), and \$1.8 billion, or 12%, below the President's \$15.1 billion FY2001 request.

The House bill increases the President's request for child survival and infectious disease programs (\$815 million) and international fund for Ireland (\$25 million). Like the Senate measure, the House bill reduces the President's proposed budget in many areas: aid to the former Soviet Union (\$740 million; -\$90 million), debt reduction (\$82.4 million; -\$180 million), the World Bank's International Development Association (\$576.6 million; -\$260 million), and the Global Environment Facility (\$35.8 million; -\$140 million). The House measure further continues current abortion restrictions applied to USAID population aid.

H.R. 4811 dramatically cuts funding for the poorest countries in the world, disproportionately hurting African and Latin American countries. The bill contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million (requested for multilateral debt relief assistance—in complete disregard of the commitment made by the G-7 countries more than 2 years ago to provide urgent debt relief. Overall cuts to programs that assist Africa and Latin America total 15%. The bill cuts funding for international financial institutions that provide loans to poor countries by one-third.

Cuts of this magnitude will make it impossible to halt the spread of infectious disease, alleviate poverty, and provide access to family planning. The countries of sub-Saharan Africa are forced to spend more each year repaying debt than they are able to spend on primary education and health care. According to the World Bank, sub-Saharan African governments owe foreign creditors an average of almost \$400 for every man, woman, and child—more than most Africans make in a year.

H.R. 4811 cuts funding to fight AIDS by nearly 20%, providing only \$202 million of the \$244 million requested. In many countries, up to one-fourth of the adult population is infected with this horrible disease and funds are desperately needed to combat its spread. In addition, H.R. 4811 cuts funds requested for family

planning 29% below the amount requested. The bill codifies the "Mexico City" restrictions on international funds for family planning and extends those restrictions to all forms of lobbying.

The President's senior advisors are recommending that he veto the bill.

DEBT RELIEF AND H. RES. 546

A group of Democratic House members urged colleagues today to vote down the rule (H. Res. 546) governing floor debate on a fiscal 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill because it would not permit amendments to boost funding for debt relief to the world's poorest nations.

The rule would not protect an amendment by Representative PELOSI, to provide an extra \$390 million on top of the bill's \$82 million allocation to match the amount President Clinton requested for debt relief over fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

Treasury Secretary Summers and AFL-CIO President John Sweeney joined lawmakers at a press conference criticizing GOP leaders for not supporting Clinton's request. "It is imperative for our country morally, economically and diplomatically to provide this debt relief," Summers said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has expired.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns over the level of funding for international financial institutions. Specifically, I want to talk about this nation's debt relief efforts. Unfortunately, this bill reduces debt relief efforts by \$40 million from last year. I fully understand the budgetary environment that Chairman CALLAHAN is working under and it is my hope that when this bill becomes its final product, that we increase the amount we appropriate to debt relief.

I would also acknowledge the thoughtful and inciteful statement of our colleague from Alabama, Representative BACHUS.

Last year with bipartisan support, Congress made important steps in addressing the problem of debt relief for poor countries. Congress appropriated \$123 million to begin canceling the debts that reforming poor countries owe the United States, and agreed that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) can use \$2.3 billion of its own resources to finance its contribution to debt relief.

The Banking Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, authorized U.S. participation in international debt relief efforts when it passed H.R. 1095. Many important elements of H.R. 1095 were included in last year's Omnibus appropriations package.

These elements included that:

Poor countries must engage in an economic reform program,

Poor countries must promote civil society participation,

Poor countries must implement anti-corruption measures,

Poor countries must create programs for poverty reduction, and

Poor countries must strengthen private sector growth, trade, and investment.

Our bill excluded poor countries that violated human rights, supported terrorism, or spend too much of their resources on their military.

Much of the effort to provide for debt relief came from the work of so many people of different faiths during Jubilee 2000. Jubilee 2000 drew its inspiration from the Book of Leviticus in Hebrew Scriptures. In the Jubilee year, social inequities are rectified, slaves are freed, and debts are forgiven. I know that it is the Committee's position that it supports the efforts of Jubilee 2000. That is not in question here.

The question is how best to proceed. I want to work with the Chairman on this important issue and work to find more funding for debt relief.

I know that debt relief alone cannot solve the problems of the world's poorest countries. But it is an important start and a start that we must make.

I look forward to working with the distinguished chairman on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN for his service on this subcommittee. It has not always been an easy job. But his knowledge, graciousness, and willingness to reach across the aisle to do what is right is a hallmark of his service. I look forward to continue to work with him in his next capacity.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, AIDS—such an ugly disease to think about. This ugly disease which emerged from the shadows 2 decades ago, has devastated whole regions, knocked decades off national development, widened the gulf between rich and poor nations and pushed already-stigmatized groups closer to the margins of society.

Well, shouldn't we do more to extinguish such an ugly disease at home and abroad? The time to act is now. AIDS is one of the most critical development issues confronting our world.

A decade ago, HIV/AIDS was regarded primarily as a serious health crisis. During that time, estimates in 1991 predicted that in sub-Saharan Africa, by the end of the decade, 9 million people would be infected and 5 million would die. Well, that was a threefold underestimation. Today, it is clear that AIDS is a development crisis, and in some parts of the world is rapidly becoming a security crisis too.

The cumulative effect of millions of AIDS deaths is causing havoc in households, communities and economies in countries where HIV started spreading 2 decades ago. Altogether, 95% of the global epidemic is concentrated in the developing world, which has inadequate resources for halting the HIV spread and alleviating its devastating consequences. It is a fact that AIDS is unique in its devastating impact on the social, economic and demographic underpinnings of development.

The time to act is now. Support our colleague's amendment to include an additional \$42 million, per the President's request, to the \$202 million provided for the USAID global HIV/AIDS program.

□ 2100

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentlewoman withdraw her amendment?

Ms. PELOSI. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am going to, if the gentlewoman does not withdraw it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman for his course of action.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. PELOSI. Only to make two points, Mr. Chairman: A, this is an emergency; and, B, there is precedent in the legislation with the funding for flooding in Mozambique and southern Africa.

So it would be consistent with what is in the bill already for the majority to withdraw the point of order and give the body a chance to work its will on the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. With the emergency designations in the amendment, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI, and therefore the point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce to the membership that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) will make a motion to rise. The Committee will not be rising for the evening, it will be for the purpose of appointing conferees on the defense appropriations bill. Then we will go back into the committee and go back to the consideration of the foreign operations bill.

The intent is to work as late as we can this evening. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have been working diligently to come to an agreement that we will be able to get the House adjourned at least no later than 5 o'clock tomorrow, having completed the foreign operations bill.

So we will tend to this business, then come back to the foreign operations bill, get through as much of it as we can this evening, and try to finish it tomorrow before 5 o'clock so Members can make their plans for the weekend.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, DICKEY, FRELINGHUYSEN, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKEY, MORAN of Virginia and OBEY.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves that pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the committee meetings on the bill, H.R. 4576, be closed to the public at such time as classified national security information is under consideration, provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 7, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Barr	Biggert
Ackerman	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Aderholt	Barrett (WI)	Bilirakis
Allen	Bartlett	Bishop
Andrews	Barton	Blagojevich
Armey	Bass	Bliley
Bachus	Bateman	Blunt
Baird	Becerra	Boehlert
Baker	Bentsen	Boehner
Baldacci	Bereuter	Bonilla
Baldwin	Berkley	Bonior
Ballenger	Berman	Bono
Barcia	Berry	Boswell